

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty
of
Xavier University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science
by
Joseph Ostrowski
August 4, 2020

Approved:

Morrie Mullins, Ph.D.

Morrie Mullins, Ph.D.

Chair, School of Psychology

Mark S. Nagy

Mark S. Nagy, Ph.D.

Thesis Chair

Applicant Reactions to the Use of LinkedIn
in Recruitment and Selection

Thesis Committee

Chair	Mark Nagy, Ph.D. Associate Professor, School of Psychology
Member	Dalia Diab, Ph.D. Associate Professor, School of Psychology
Member	Morrie Mullins, Ph.D. Professor and Chair, School of Psychology

Acknowledgments

I would like to recognize the invaluable assistance of my thesis chair, Dr. Mark Nagy, for his support, guidance, and feedback throughout each stage of the process. His advice and expertise kept me on track through numerous setbacks. I would also like to thank the remainder of my thesis committee, Dr. Dalia Diab and Dr. Morrie Mullins, as well as my classmates for their input and support along the way. These individuals encouraged my best efforts and motivated me to persevere through the challenges of the program.

Finally, I would like to thank Barbara Turner-Michaelson and Nichole Arbino from Xavier University's Career Development Office for their feedback as well. Their feedback helped me fine-tune this study's methodology.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments.....	1
Table of Contents	2
List of Tables	3
List of Appendices	4
Abstract	5
Chapter	
I. Review of the Literature	6
II. Rationale and Hypotheses	26
III. Method	31
IV. Results	38
V. Discussion	46
VI. Summary	59
References	67
Appendices.....	74

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Correlation Matrix for Applicant Reaction Variables	39
2. Correlation Matrix for Organizational Attractiveness Variables.....	42

List of Appendices

Appendix	Page
A. Participant Recruitment Posting	74
B. Procedural Justice Items	75
C. Organizational Attraction Items.....	76
D. LinkedIn Recruitment Vignettes.....	77
E. Reaction and Attraction Items	79
F. Demographic Items.....	80
G. IRB Approval Letter	81
H. Informed Consent.....	82
I. Participant Write-In Items.....	84

Abstract

This study investigated applicant reactions to and perceived organizational attraction with the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process. Participants completed both phases of a two-phase survey. Phase One investigated applicant reactions and perceptions of organizational attractiveness based on the use of LinkedIn, Facebook, or no social networking site (i.e., résumés) in the recruitment and selection process from a dimensional perspective. Phase Two explored overall applicant reactions and perceived organizational attractiveness with different types of LinkedIn recruitment (i.e., active, passive, absent). Participants preferred LinkedIn to Facebook in the recruitment and selection process but did not show a consistent preference when comparing LinkedIn to no SNS. Results also indicated that participants preferred active LinkedIn recruitment to passive LinkedIn recruitment in terms of overall applicant reactions and perceived organizational attractiveness. These results suggest that if organizations are going to use social networking sites in recruitment and selection, they should use LinkedIn. However, organizations may want to be cautious regarding the use of LinkedIn as it appears that applicants still prefer the use of no SNS in the recruitment and selection process in regards to opportunity to perform and invasion of privacy.

Chapter I

Review of the Literature

In the last decade, Social Network Sites (SNSs) have experienced rapid growth (Gerard, 2012). SNSs are internet-based platforms allowing individuals to (1) create a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) compile a list of other users with whom they are connected and, (3) view and navigate their list of connections and connections made by other users within the system (Boyd & Ellison, 2008). There are many sites fitting the SNS criteria such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, and LinkedIn, some of which are used in the recruitment and selection process and the job search process.

Organizational decision-makers and applicants perceive SNSs to be valuable tools in the recruitment and selection process as well as in the job search process. SNSs provide additional avenues for recruiters to attract applicants (Nikolaou, 2014), reach a greater number of applicants, and gather more information about candidates when deciding whom to invite for an interview (Caers & Castelyns, 2011). As described by Chambers and Winter (2017), a Jobvite survey estimated that 92% of recruiters use SNSs as a recruitment tool. Furthermore, SNSs influence hiring managers' evaluations of candidates (Bohnert & Ross, 2010). On the other hand, SNSs provide individuals with broad professional networking opportunities (Nikolaou, 2014), which have long been considered an effective job search activity (Van Hove, Van Hooft, & Lievens, 2009). With the widespread use of SNSs by hiring managers and job seekers, how applicants react to the use of SNSs in the recruitment and selection process is a question worthy

of investigation. More specifically, examining how different SNSs and actions taken by recruiters using SNSs may provide insight into how SNSs should be best utilized in recruitment and selection and minimize any possible adverse effects. The following sections will explore the current literature pertaining to SNS recruitment and selection, explain the issues surrounding it, and discuss some advantages as well as disadvantages of the practice from the perspective of both organizational decision-makers and applicants.

Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment, as defined by Mondy (as cited in Gusdorf, 2008), is “the process of attracting individuals on a timely basis, in sufficient numbers, and with appropriate qualifications, to apply for jobs with an organization” (p. 1). Stated more simply, recruitment is the process of attracting qualified job applicants. There are many recruitment methods including internal recruitment, external recruitment, and internet recruitment. Internal recruitment refers to recruiting existing employees from within an organization for new positions. External recruitment refers to activities intended to bring a job opening to the attention of potential job applicants who do not currently work for an organization and influence their application intentions (Breaugh, 2013). In external recruitment, recruiters facilitate this process.

The current study’s focus is on internet recruitment which, in the context of this manuscript, is primarily a form of external recruitment. Internet recruiting allows recruiters to easily and quickly post job openings and receive responses (Gusdorf, 2008). In internet recruitment, recruiters post job openings on online job boards (e.g., Monster.com, Indeed.com) or in online SNSs (e.g., Facebook, LinkedIn), which allows potential applicants to view them. SNSs have an advantage over online job boards in that they allow for direct virtual interaction between potential applicants and recruiters (Blacksmith & Poepelman, 2014). This interaction

allows recruiters to learn more about potential applicants by viewing their profiles, which enables recruiters to evaluate the recruit's fit with the job and organization in which the recruiter is employed. Furthermore, through SNSs, recruiters can directly reach out to possible applicants.

Once the recruitment process has been used to identify job candidates and influence them to apply to the open position within the organization, the selection process begins. The goal of the selection process is to evaluate a group of candidates in order to choose the individual that is best suited for the position and the organization (Gusdorf, 2008). After the candidate applies for the position, there are many subsequent steps before a hiring decision is made. Some of these steps could include a screening interview (usually conducted over the phone), selection tests (e.g., intelligence tests, personality tests, integrity tests), a formal interview, and a reference or background check. As this is likely an applicant's first exposure to the organization, it is during these steps that applicants begin to form impressions of the organization. These impressions may be influenced by the applicant's fairness perceptions of this process (Gilliland & Steiner, 2001).

Organizational Justice

Gilliland (1993) applied organizational justice theories of applicant reactions to the selection process to model applicants' fairness perceptions. In this model, organizational justice includes procedural justice and distributive justice. Procedural justice is concerned with the perceived fairness of the methods used in the selection process, whereas distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the distribution of procedural outcomes which, in the context of selection, is the hiring decision. Subsequent research (e.g., Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001) identified interactional justice, which refers to the behavior of decision-makers during the implementation of selection procedures and encompasses the subdimensions of interpersonal justice and informational justice, but interactional justice is widely considered to be

a subdimension of procedural justice (Colquitt et al., 2001; Gilliland & Steiner, 2001).

Interpersonal justice focuses on the interpersonal treatment of applicants, whereas informational justice focuses on explanations and justifications given to applicants during the selection process (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Based on Gilliland's (1993) model of organizational justice, Bauer, McCarthy, Anderson, Truxillo, and Salgado (2012) summarized 10 rules that enhance experiences of fairness from the applicant's perspective. These 10 rules are to (1) ensure that the selection procedures are related to the job, (2) allow the applicants the opportunity to perform, (3) give applicants the chance to contest their results, (4) ensure consistency of procedures across all applicants, (5) offer applicants informative and prompt feedback, (6) offer explanations and justification for the procedures and/or decisions, (7) ensure honesty when communicating with applicants, (8) treat applicants with warmth and respect, (9) sustain the two-way communication process, and (10) ensure the legality and non-discriminatory nature of questions and procedures. Although all of these rules are considered procedural justice rules, rules five through nine fall under the interactional justice subdimension (Gilliland & Steiner, 2001), and all of the rules pertain to applicant reactions.

Applicant Reactions

Adherence to Gilliland's (1993) organizational justice rules during the recruitment and selection process, specifically those regarding procedural justice, plays a significant role in determining applicant reactions (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). Applicant reactions are important for organizations to consider because the consequences of negative applicant reactions could include job offer rejection, negative recommendations, low job satisfaction, low organizational commitment, and less consumption of an organization's products or services (Gilliland, 1993;

Gilliland & Steiner, 2001). According to Steiner and Gilliland (1996), six critical aspects of procedural justice that apply to applicant reactions to a selection method include whether the method is constructed using sound scientific research, the procedure's perceived job-relatedness (i.e., face validity), whether the procedure is able to detect an applicant's important differentiating qualities, whether the selection method is perceived to be impersonal and cold, the propriety of questions or methods, and the employer's right to acquire information through a method.

These rules are consistent with many of the rules that Bauer et al. (2012) noted influence fairness perceptions of the selection process. Specifically, sound scientific construction is akin to rule six, which is to have explanations and justifications for procedures. Perceived job relatedness is a reflection of rule one, which is to ensure that the selection procedures are related to the job. A procedure's ability to detect important differentiating qualities is related to rule two, which is opportunity to perform. The perceived impersonal or cold nature of a procedure is a reflection of rule eight, which is to treat applicants with warmth and respect. The propriety of questions or methods is analogous to rule ten, which is to ensure the legality and non-discriminatory nature of questions and procedures. Lastly, employers' right to acquire information is related to rule seven, which is honesty.

Steiner and Gilliland (1996) also pointed out an additional dimension of procedural justice, which they called invasion of privacy. Although not a formal procedural justice rule, invasion of privacy may also be related to Gilliland's (1993) rule seven, which is honesty. Specifically, it may be considered dishonest to explore an applicant's SNS profile unbeknownst to the applicant. Because many individuals believe SNSs are intended for personal use (Kluemper, Mitra, & Wang, 2016), having a potential employer access their SNSs may be

perceived as an inappropriate invasion of privacy and consequently dishonest, especially if the individual is unaware of an employer accessing their SNSs.

Steiner and Gilliland (1996) tested the influence of these procedural justice rules (i.e., explanations and justifications, job-relatedness, opportunity to perform, interpersonal treatment, propriety of questions and methods, honesty) as well as pervasiveness of use and invasion of privacy on applicant reactions. In their study, Steiner and Gilliland (1996) developed a measure which asked participants to think of a job to which they would apply. The participants were then asked to respond to two questions regarding the effectiveness and fairness of various selection methods as they pertained to that job on a 7-point scale. Following this, participants were prompted to respond, on a 7-point scale, to seven items assessing the perceived procedural justice of each selection method.

Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) study revealed that face validity (i.e., job-relatedness) was most predictive of favorable applicant reactions, followed by widespread use of the selection method and the employers' right to obtain information. Opportunity to perform and scientific evidence were slightly less predictive of applicant reactions, but interpersonal warmth and respect for privacy were the least predictive. The results of Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) study illustrate the importance of Gilliland's (1993) individual organizational justice rules. However, because Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) study was conducted before the advent of SNSs, applicant reactions based on Gilliland's (1993) organizational justice rules no longer apply, as SNSs have drastically changed the recruiting and job search landscape (Blacksmith & Poeppelman, 2014; Caers & Castelyns, 2007). This may especially be the case because of the varying types of SNSs currently available.

Professional versus Recreational SNSs

For purposes of this research, one can segment SNS purposes into two categories: professional or recreational. A professional SNS (pSNS; e.g., LinkedIn) is intended to help individuals find career opportunities and advance their careers by connecting with other professionals (Kluemper et al., 2016), whereas a recreational SNS (rSNS; e.g., Facebook) is intended to allow individuals to share information with their non-professional (i.e., personal, recreational) network (Kluemper et al., 2016).

Previous research has supported this distinction between professional and recreational uses of SNSs (e.g., Aguado, Rico, Rubio, & Fernandez, 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015). Specifically, Caers and Castelyns (2011) found that individuals perceive LinkedIn to be suited for a number of professionally oriented activities, such as keeping up with friends' career developments and developments in organizations in which one was not employed as well as scheduling professional appointments. On the other hand, Facebook was not considered to be suited for any of these activities. Furthermore, applicants considered LinkedIn more effective than Facebook in the job search process (Nikolaou, 2014). This distinction between LinkedIn and Facebook helps explain Aguado et al.'s (2016) finding that individuals react significantly more positively to the use of pSNSs than to the use of rSNSs in recruitment and selection.

Within psychology, a majority of the research (e.g., Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015; Elias et al., 2016; Gerard, 2012; Guilroy & Hancock, 2012; Roulin & Levashina, 2018) on LinkedIn has been concerned with personnel management and selection, as well as other related industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology or human resource management (HRM) domains. This research focus is logical based on LinkedIn's vision to "create economic

opportunity for every member of the global workforce,” and its mission statement to “connect the world’s professionals to make them more productive and successful” (LinkedIn, 2018).

These vision and mission statements imply that LinkedIn’s goal is to aid individuals in gaining employment and success thereafter. Thus, LinkedIn is a pSNS intended to help individuals find career opportunities and advance their careers. In fact, LinkedIn refers to itself as “the world’s leading professional network” (LinkedIn, 2018). Because LinkedIn is the dominant pSNS in the United States, this manuscript will focus on how LinkedIn is used by organizational decision-makers and how that use is perceived by applicants.

Perceptions of LinkedIn

It is apparent that scholars (e.g., Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015; Kluemper et al., 2016) consider LinkedIn a pSNS, but it is less clear how individuals perceive and react to the use of LinkedIn in the context of recruitment and selection.

Furthermore, although LinkedIn is known by organizational decision-makers as a valuable tool in the recruitment and selection process (Chambers & Winter, 2017; Cober, Brown, Keeping, & Levy, 2004; Nikolaou, 2014; Roulin & Levashina, 2018), it is necessary to take a closer look at the ways organizational decision-makers use LinkedIn.

Applicants and job seekers. Research has found that individuals consider LinkedIn a pSNS as opposed to a rSNS (e.g., Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015; Nikolaou, 2014). In a study regarding the use of LinkedIn for recruitment and selection, Caers and Castelyns (2011) found that participants perceived LinkedIn to be useful for keeping up with career developments of friends and developments in organizations in which they were not employed. Participants also considered LinkedIn an appropriate method for scheduling professional appointments. A significant majority of participants in Caers and Castelyns’ (2011)

study considered LinkedIn helpful in self-promotion by posting training and professional experiences on their profiles.

The main advantages for job seekers using LinkedIn, as opposed to more traditional job-seeking methods (e.g., employment agencies, newspaper advertisements, job boards), is that they can become more visible to recruiters and can leverage broad networking opportunities (Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Elias et al., 2016; Nikolaou, 2014), thereby increasing their chances of finding a position. LinkedIn allows job seekers to make their profiles available in searches. By doing this, job seekers increase their chances of being found and subsequently recruited. Furthermore, LinkedIn allows job seekers to make connections with others. These connections may be friends, colleagues, superiors, or subordinates, all of whom may enable the job seeker to find an opportunity.

Once an individual becomes interested in an open position within an organization, he or she will most likely want to learn more about that organization. LinkedIn enables job seekers to learn more about an organization, as many organizations have LinkedIn profiles. Potential applicants can visit the LinkedIn profile of an organization and infer qualities the organization possesses based on information such as the organization's description, its leaders, and its posts. Job seekers can even apply for open positions directly through LinkedIn. Although all of this information can be available on the organization's LinkedIn profile, what is available is at the discretion of the organization.

Just as organizations can choose what to include in their LinkedIn profile, so can job seekers. Caers and Castelyns (2011) found that LinkedIn can be used to promote training and professional experiences by including it in a profile. To a lesser extent, Caers and Castelyns (2011) found that participants felt they could promote themselves through LinkedIn by having

more connections, especially when those connections were important and influential. Preliminary research has shown that hiring managers viewed profiles containing pictures and skill endorsements more positively than those which did not (Roulin & Levashina, 2018). Roulin and Levashina (2018) also found that hiring managers considered profile length and number of connections to be positive aspects of a LinkedIn profile.

Organizational decision-makers and recruiters. Organizational decision-makers (e.g., hiring managers, HR practitioners) and recruiters use SNSs as a means to screen applicants and recruits as it allows them to gain large amounts of information that can be used to supplement other information (e.g., résumés) cost-effectively (Slovensky & Ross, 2012). Additionally, SNSs allow recruiters to initiate contact with passive candidates (i.e., individuals not actively looking for employment) as well as active job seekers (Nikolaou, 2014). Furthermore, LinkedIn was used to find additional information about applicants by 70% of active users involved in the recruitment and evaluation of applicants (Caers & Castelyns, 2011).

Using SNSs as a Selection Tool

Advantages. Apart from the previously mentioned findings that solidify LinkedIn as a pSNS and show that it can influence organizational decision-makers' evaluations (e.g., Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015; Kluemper et al., 2016; Nikolaou, 2014; Roulin & Levashina, 2018), other findings support the use of LinkedIn as a selection tool. These findings are generally concerned with the reliability and validity of LinkedIn as a selection tool, but also show that using LinkedIn can offer time and financial benefits to organizations in the selection process (Slovensky & Ross, 2012).

Using LinkedIn allows organizations to quickly and efficiently gather large amounts of information about candidates (Slovensky & Ross, 2012). This information enables hiring

managers and HR professionals to gain a more comprehensive profile of applicants. Because it saves time in the information gathering process, LinkedIn saves the organization money by allowing employees that are responsible for such tasks to be more productive and gather candidate information more efficiently.

An important finding regarding the quality of applicant assessments using LinkedIn is that, although a majority of individuals use deception in their résumés, individuals tended to be more truthful regarding verifiable information (e.g., experience, responsibilities) when creating a résumé via LinkedIn as opposed to a traditional résumé (Guillory & Hancock, 2012). Applicants did, however, employ deception regarding unverifiable information (e.g., interests) more when creating résumés via LinkedIn than when creating traditional résumés (Guillory & Hancock, 2012). This use of deception could be because the verifiable nature of such information (e.g., experience, responsibilities) makes lying about it easier to detect, whereas it is difficult to detect deception regarding interests in the absence of an interview. This finding supports the assertion by Slovensky and Ross (2012) that LinkedIn profiles can be used to detect discrepancies in application materials. However, these studies (Guillory & Hancock, 2012; Slovensky & Ross, 2012) did not specifically investigate the reliability and validity of LinkedIn as a tool in recruitment and selection. Because recruiters focus more on job-related information in SNS profiles (Chiang & Suen, 2015), the previous results show the need to establish reliability and validity of LinkedIn as a selection tool.

To answer this need, Roulin and Levashina (2018) studied the psychometric properties of LinkedIn as a selection tool and found that it indeed does have a moderate degree of reliability and validity. Specifically, they found LinkedIn to have interrater reliability among experienced MBA student raters as well as temporal stability regarding skills, personality, cognitive ability,

and hiring recommendations. Roulin and Levashina (2018) reported intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) of .45 at time one and .40 at time two for skills; ICCs for personality of .37 and .45 at time one and two, respectively; ICCs of .63 at time one and .57 at time two for cognitive ability; and ICCs of .58 and .75 for hiring recommendations at time one and two, respectively. Temporal stability was also found for skills ($r = .51$), personality ($r = .52$), cognitive ability ($r = .58$), and hiring recommendations ($r = .58$). Furthermore, convergent validity was found between rater assessments and self-reports of visible skills ($r = .26$; e.g., leadership, planning, communication), extroversion ($r = .20$), and cognitive ability ($r = .30$). Additionally, Roulin and Levashina (2018) also found criterion-related validity between raters hiring recommendations and obtaining a job congruent with an individual's degree ($r = .20$), the number of jobs an individual held congruent with their degree ($r = .25$), and being promoted ($r = .20$).

From their findings, Roulin and Levashina (2018) suggested that LinkedIn can be a reliable tool for hiring managers in the assessment of visible skills (e.g., planning and communication), extroversion, and cognitive ability. Furthermore, their findings advocate for the predictive validity of LinkedIn assessments regarding job performance. Ultimately, Roulin and Levashina (2018) demonstrated that LinkedIn was reliable regarding the assessment of all four criteria examined: skills, personality, cognitive ability, and hiring recommendations.

Disadvantages. Although LinkedIn provides many advantages in the recruitment and selection process, there are some possible disadvantages as well. These disadvantages range from negative applicant evaluations and reactions (e.g., Aguado et al., 2016; Madera, 2012; Slovensky & Ross, 2012; Stoughton, Thompson, & Meade, 2015) to possible violations of Equal

Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) laws (e.g., Elias et al., 2014; Slovensky & Ross, 2012).

Research has found that organizations using SNSs as a selection tool generate adverse applicant reactions due to fairness and privacy concerns (Madera, 2012; Slovensky & Ross, 2012). These adverse reactions include lower organizational attraction and reduced job pursuit intentions (Madera, 2012; Stoughton et al., 2015). Most studies have found negative applicant reactions regarding the use of SNSs for selection. However, these studies either did not specify a SNS (e.g., Madera, 2012) or used rSNSs (e.g., Facebook; Stoughton et al., 2015). These negative reactions are not surprising considering that Facebook is perceived as a rSNS (Caers & Castelyns, 2011), and is by far the most popular SNS (Smith & Anderson, 2018).

One study that differentiated between rSNSs and pSNSs (Aguado et al., 2016) found that applicants reacted significantly more positively to the use of a pSNS (e.g., LinkedIn) than to the use of a rSNS (e.g., Facebook) in selection and assessment. This more positive reaction was consistent across gender and age groups. The reason behind these reactions is that pSNSs have content intended for employers to see, whereas rSNSs have content intended for friends and other non-professional contacts, not potential (or current) employers.

Other possible disadvantages of using SNSs, namely LinkedIn, in recruitment and selection include possible violations of EEOC guidelines, namely adverse impact (i.e., CRA-91). Adverse impact occurs when selection criteria that appear neutral disproportionately exclude more of one group than another (Gutman, Koppes, & Vodanovich, 2011). Because 85% of LinkedIn users are White, but only 4% are African American and 2% are Hispanic (Elias et al., 2016), there is a possibility of adverse impact occurring with the use of LinkedIn for recruitment and selection. However, Roulin and Levashina (2018) found that adverse impact is not a significant

concern when using LinkedIn for selection as there was no significant difference between hiring recommendations of males and females, as well as no differences between White and non-White candidates. These findings, however, do not necessarily imply that the use of LinkedIn is free from the risk of adverse impact, as the low percentage of minorities using LinkedIn could result in adverse impact if an organization relies solely on LinkedIn for selection.

Organizational Attractiveness

Another potential outcome of using LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process is that the use of LinkedIn to attract applicants may influence an organization's perceived attractiveness, or organizational attraction as referred to by Highhouse, Lievens, and Sinar (2003). Anderson, Ahmed, and Costa (2012) found a significant positive correlation between applicant reactions based on Gilliland's (1993) procedural justice framework and organizational attractiveness based on an organization's general attractiveness, applicant employment pursuit intentions, and organizational prestige. Additionally, previous research has used organizational attractiveness as a proxy for applicant reactions (e.g., Stoughton et al., 2015) as applicant reactions impact their level of attraction.

Theory of reasoned action. Guiding the research on organizational attractiveness is Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action, which postulates that a rational sequence of cognitions, starting with attitudes and culminating in actions, leads to behavior. In other words, an individual's attitude, which is influenced by subjective norms (i.e., the social appropriateness of a behavior), leads to the individual's intention to engage in a behavior, and this intention determines the individual's behavior.

In terms of the theory of reasoned action, organizational attraction would begin with applicant attitudes toward an organization which are influenced by applicant reactions to the

recruitment and selection process. These reactions can, in large part, be anticipated using Gilliland's (1993) organizational justice framework (Gilliland & Steiner, 2001), in which applicants react to the perceived fairness of methods used in the recruitment and selection process. Applicant attitudes then impact applicant intentions which, in turn, influence applicant behaviors. Thus, it is crucial for an organization to consider applicant reactions during the recruitment and selection process because it ultimately influences applicant attraction to an organization. Hence, organizational decision-makers must understand the mechanisms underlying organizational attraction.

General attractiveness, intentions to pursue, and organization prestige. Past research has not always agreed on the dimensionality of organizational attractiveness (e.g., Fisher, Ilgen, & Hoyer 1979; Singh, 1973; Vroom, 1966). However, through an examination of that research, Highhouse et al. (2003) created an inclusive measure of organizational attraction. Initially, organizational attractiveness was considered unidimensional and referred to as general attractiveness by Vroom (1966), who viewed it as a company-specific attitude regarding how attractive a hypothetical organization was to a potential applicant (Highhouse et al., 2003). Vroom's conceptualization was extended by Singh (1973) to assess the attitude of organizational choice by considering the likelihood of accepting a job with the hypothetical organization (Highhouse et al., 2003). These attitudinal items align with the attitude component of the theory of reasoned action and began to extend attitudes to intentions by asking about intended choices.

Singh's (1973) extension of organizational attractiveness by including job acceptance allowed Fisher et al. (1979) to introduced pursuit intentions with items pertaining to an applicant's interest in and willingness to pursue employment with an organization. Items assessing pursuit intentions combine the attitude (i.e., interest) and intention (i.e., pursuit)

components of the theory of reasoned action as intentions are predicated on attitudes. A pursuit intention item may ask an applicant to respond to an item such as, “I am very interested in pursuing my application with this company if offered one” (Fisher et al., 1979). In current measures of organizational attractiveness, pursuit intentions include Singh’s (1973) notion of job acceptance.

Both general attractiveness and pursuit intentions could be used to gauge applicant reactions to the use of LinkedIn in recruitment and selection. The general attractiveness of an organization is indicative of applicant reactions because negative applicant reactions may lead to low general attractiveness scores. Pursuit intentions are indicative of applicant reactions in the same way; organizations that evoke negative applicant reactions will likely result in lower pursuit intentions because they are perceived as less attractive employers. Following this reasoning, if the use of LinkedIn in recruitment and selection causes negative applicant reactions, the organization will be perceived as less attractive and evoke fewer pursuit intentions.

The final dimension of Highhouse et al.’s (2003) measure of organizational attractiveness is organization prestige. Organization prestige is an imperative aspect of organizational attractiveness as it relates to the subjective norms component of the theory of reasoned action (i.e., the social appropriateness of the behavior). Highhouse et al. (2003) define organizational prestige as a social consensus of an organization’s name, invoking a sense of fame and renown. Researchers have manipulated organizational prestige in different ways. For example, Highhouse, Beadle, Gallo, and Miller (1998) found that vacancy scarcity (i.e., fewer job openings) and time scarcity (i.e., shorter application period) of a position increased applicants’ perception of an organization’s prestige. In a different vein, Turban and Greening (1996) found that organizations with greater corporate social performance (CSP), which they defined as an

organization's responsibilities to its employees and the community in which it operates, have more positive reputations and are subsequently perceived to be more attractive and prestigious employers.

Regarding LinkedIn in recruitment and selection, organizational prestige may operate in a different way than general attraction and pursuit intentions. The use of LinkedIn likely would not influence an organization's prestige because prestige is a social construct, not an individual evaluation. However, an organization's prestige may affect individual applicant reactions to the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process by an organization. Turban, Forret, and Hendrickson (1998) reported that the prestige of an organization positively impacted applicant perceptions of recruiter behavior. Based on Turban et al. (1998) as well as the findings mentioned previously (i.e., Highhouse et al., 1998, Turban & Greening, 1996), it could be reasoned that company prestige may impact the reactions of applicants to the use of LinkedIn for selection purposes. Because organizations considered more prestigious were perceived to be more attractive employers (Turban et al., 1998), and the use of SNSs in the recruitment and selection process generally evokes negative reactions from applicants (Aguado et al., 2016; Bauer et al., 2012; Madera, 2012; Slovensky & Ross, 2012; Stoughton et al., 2015), an organization's prestige could influence applicant reactions toward the use of LinkedIn in recruitment and selection positively, such that a prestigious organization may evoke less negative reactions when using SNSs and LinkedIn specifically.

To assess organizational attraction, Highhouse et al. (2003) developed a measure based on Fishbein and Ajzen's (1980) theory of reasoned action that included three subscales: general attractiveness, intentions to pursue, and prestige. In Highhouse et al.'s (2003) model, prestige and general attractiveness were significantly correlated and ultimately led to applicant pursuit

intentions. Highhouse et al. (2003) noted that there were some cross-loadings and high correlations among these three dimensions but argued that this was not an issue because the path coefficients of the three dimensions supported the theory of reasoned action in that all three dimensions were related and each impacted the other culminating in applicants' attraction to an organization.

Media richness, social presence, and LinkedIn. Two additional factors that have been investigated concerning SNSs and organizational attractiveness are media richness and social presence. Media richness refers to the ability of a medium to communicate a message based on immediate feedback, multiple cues, language clarity, and personal focus available in a medium (Ishii, Lyons, & Carr, 2019). The richest media would be a face-to-face conversation because it allows for instantaneous feedback, recognition of many cues (e.g., body language), language clarity as the way in which one speaks can send certain signals, and is innately personal. On the other hand, a billboard could be considered to have little richness as no feedback or cues are available, the language may be ambiguous, and the communication is rarely tailored to a specific audience. In other words, media richness theory states that richer media is better able to communicate complex and ambiguous information, making it more effective in conveying persuasive messages (Carpentier et al., 2017). Media richness is an important aspect of SNSs in the recruitment and selection process because LinkedIn allows for widespread interactive communication between applicants and organizations.

Social presence is another factor that has been investigated in relation to SNSs and organizational attraction. Social presence refers to the ability of media to convey interpersonal warmth. An SNS can possess social presence because it allows for personal, albeit virtual, interaction that is capable of conveying interpersonal warmth in the form of SNS facilitated

communication. Carpentier et al. (2017) found that because SNSs are media-rich and have social presence, organizational use of SNSs can increase an organization's attractiveness. This increase in organizational attractiveness was significant for Facebook, but not for LinkedIn. However, Carpentier et al. (2017) were not investigating SNSs as recruitment tools, but how exposure to organizations on SNSs impacted their attractiveness to applicants. Furthermore, Sivertzen, Nilsen, and Olafsen (2017; as cited in Carpentier et al., 2017) found that applicant exposure to organizational information through social media was positively related to overall corporate reputation, which suggests that an organization merely having a SNS profile may increase its attractiveness.

Factors Contributing to LinkedIn being Under-Researched

Although a majority of organizations and hiring professionals use LinkedIn for recruitment and selection (Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Madera, 2012; Roulin & Levashina, 2018), there has been little empirical research conducted regarding its effectiveness and consequences. This may be because, until recently, LinkedIn has not been as popular of an SNS as others (e.g., Facebook). For example, Browser Media (as cited in Chambers & Winter, 2017) estimated LinkedIn to have only had 50,000 users in 2010, whereas Facebook was estimated to have 350,000. Although LinkedIn's user base probably did not warrant its investigation from an I-O psychology perspective in 2010, recent estimates place LinkedIn's users at over 590 million (LinkedIn, 2018).

Furthermore, before research could be conducted on LinkedIn, researchers had to establish the groundwork for such research by investigating SNSs in general. Because SNSs are a relatively new concept that have only recently become mainstream (Chambers & Winter, 2015), it is understandable that scholarship has not reached a point at which individual SNSs are

differentiated in research. Now that SNS membership has reached that point, and now that LinkedIn has become a mainstream SNS (LinkedIn, 2018), it is time to investigate LinkedIn in the context of recruitment and selection.

Present Study

As previously discussed, practitioners view LinkedIn as a valuable tool in the recruitment and selection process (Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Nikolaou, 2014), applicants perceive it to be useful in the job search process (Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015; Nikolaou, 2014), and researchers consider it a pSNS (Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015). LinkedIn has many advantages for practitioners (e.g., efficiency; Slovensky & Ross, 2012) as well as job seekers (e.g., professional networking, visibility; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Nikolaou, 2014), but that does not necessarily mean that LinkedIn is without disadvantages. Because research into the use of LinkedIn as well as other SNSs has found disadvantages such as increased likelihood of adverse impact (Elias et al., 2014; Slovensky & Ross, 2012), possible negative applicant reactions and reduced organizational attraction (Madera, 2012; Slovensky & Ross, 2012), and reduced job pursuit intentions (Madera, 2012; Stoughton et al., 2015), there could be disadvantages to using LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process. The goal of the present study was to investigate how the use of LinkedIn, as well as more specific uses of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process, could influence applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness.

Chapter II

Rationale and Hypotheses

Based on a review of the literature, researchers, practitioners, and applicants perceive LinkedIn to be better suited for recruitment and selection than other SNSs (Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Madera, 2012; Nikolaou, 2014; Roulin & Levashina, 2018). Multiple studies have found that a majority of organizational decision-makers view LinkedIn as a valuable tool and use it extensively in the recruitment and selection process (Chambers & Winter, 2017; Kluemper et al., 2016). Likewise, many applicants perceive LinkedIn to be efficacious in the job search process (Nikolaou, 2014), and research has shown that applicants react less negatively to the use of LinkedIn than to the use of other SNSs in the recruitment and selection process (Nikolaou, 2014).

Nevertheless, to the knowledge of this researcher, no study has investigated applicant reactions to LinkedIn exclusively. In other words, it is not known how applicants react to the organizational use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process. Such a question warrants exploration because a less negative applicant reaction compared to other SNSs (Nikolaou, 2014) does not necessarily imply a positive applicant reaction. Furthermore, while knowing the valence of applicant reactions to the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process is useful, more useful is knowing the mechanisms underlying these reactions. These underlying mechanisms are Gilliland's (1993) procedural justice rules regarding opportunity to perform and justification of methods, as well as Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) additional dimension of

invasion of privacy. Specifically, LinkedIn may be perceived as allowing applicants the opportunity to perform through self-promotion (Caers & Castelyns, 2011). Applicants may understand the justification for using LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process as it is considered by many to be an extended online résumé (Chiang & Suen, 2015). Similarly, because LinkedIn is widely considered a pSNS (Aguado, Rico, Rubio, & Fernandez, 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015), applicants may feel that an organization viewing their LinkedIn profile is not an invasion of privacy and that the organization has the right to obtain the information. Thus, the first hypotheses were as follows:

Hypothesis 1a: Applicant reactions regarding perceived opportunity to perform will be significantly more positive when recruitment and selection processes involve LinkedIn compared to Facebook.

Hypothesis 1b: Applicant reactions regarding perceived justification will be significantly more positive when recruitment and selection processes involve LinkedIn compared to Facebook.

Hypothesis 1c: Applicant reactions regarding perceived invasion of privacy will be significantly more positive when recruitment and selection processes involve LinkedIn compared to Facebook.

Additionally, LinkedIn may be associated with different applicant reactions when compared to the use of no SNS for the same reasons stated above. However, it is unknown if the reactions to LinkedIn for recruitment and selection will be more positive, more negative, or the same as no SNS. Accordingly, the following exploratory hypotheses were proposed:

Hypothesis 2a: Applicant reactions regarding perceived opportunity to perform will be significantly different when recruitment and selection processes involve LinkedIn compared to no SNS.

Hypothesis 2b: Applicant reactions regarding perceived justification will be significantly different when recruitment and selection processes involve LinkedIn compared to no SNS.

Hypothesis 2c: Applicant reactions regarding perceived invasion of privacy will be significantly different when recruitment and selection processes involve LinkedIn compared to no SNS.

Organizational attraction, referred to by Anderson et al., (2012) and Stoughton et al. (2015) as organizational attractiveness, is closely related to applicant reactions as applicant reactions impact their level of attraction to an organization. Because LinkedIn is a pSNS and the use of pSNSs is not perceived negatively by applicants (Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Nikolaou, 2014), the use of LinkedIn should not negatively influence an organization's general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, or prestige evaluations as defined by Highhouse et al.'s (2003) organizational attraction scale. Furthermore, Carpentier et al.'s (2017) study regarding media richness and social presence within SNSs suggests that the use of LinkedIn may increase an organization's attractiveness. Thus, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 3a: General attractiveness will be significantly higher when LinkedIn is used for recruitment and selection than when Facebook is used for recruitment and selection.

Hypothesis 3b: Pursuit intentions will be significantly higher when LinkedIn is used for recruitment and selection than when Facebook is used for recruitment and selection.

Hypothesis 3c: Perceived prestige will be significantly higher when LinkedIn is used for recruitment and selection than when Facebook is used for recruitment and selection.

Additionally, LinkedIn may be associated with different outcomes regarding organizational attraction when compared to the use of no SNS. Thus, the following exploratory hypotheses were specified:

Hypothesis 4a: There will be a significant difference in general attractiveness between the use of LinkedIn and no SNS.

Hypothesis 4b: There will be a significant difference in pursuit intentions between the use of LinkedIn and no SNS.

Hypothesis 4c: There will be a significant difference in perceived prestige between the use of LinkedIn and no SNS.

LinkedIn recruitment activities can be passive (e.g., suggesting that applicants connect with an organization through LinkedIn) or active (e.g., directly contacting an applicant through LinkedIn regarding a job opportunity). Accompanying active LinkedIn recruitment is the explicit presumption that the organizational representative viewed the applicant's profile and contacted the applicant based on the contents of the LinkedIn profile. This may lead to applicants feeling as though the organizational representative violated one or more of Gilliland (1993) or Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) organizational justice rules by viewing their LinkedIn profile and contacting them. Although applicants may feel that the unspecified organizational use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process does not violate Gilliland (1993) or Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) organizational justice rules (e.g., hypothesis one), specific actions taken by organizational representatives may be seen as a violation of these rules because of the unsolicited nature of the communication. Furthermore, as discussed previously, the violation of these organizational justice rules may evoke lower organizational attraction from applicants (e.g., Anderson et al., 2012). As such, the final set of hypotheses were as follows:

Hypothesis 5a: Active LinkedIn recruitment will be associated with significantly lower applicant reaction scores compared to passive LinkedIn recruitment.

Hypothesis 5b: Active LinkedIn recruitment will be associated with significantly lower organizational attractiveness scores compared to passive LinkedIn recruitment.

Chapter III

Method

Participants

The present study used a sample obtained from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). As Steiner and Gilliland (1996) found cultural differences in fairness perceptions of various selection practices, all participants resided in the United States. Additionally, participants must have completed a minimum of 50 Human Intelligence Tests (HITs) and had a minimum 95% HIT acceptance rate.

The current study utilized a single factor within-subjects design. MTurk workers accessed the study survey via the recruitment posting through their MTurk account (see Appendix A). Participants were compensated \$1.50 in exchange for their participation. Based on a power analysis suggested by Cohen (1992), with an alpha level of .05 and a power level of .80, a minimum of 64 participants were required to detect a medium effect when conducting paired comparisons. A total of 74 participants successfully completed this study. The sample was 61% male, 64.9% White, 10.8% Asian, 10.8% African American, and 10.8% Hispanic or Latino; three percent of participants did not provide their race or ethnicity. Furthermore, 32.4% of participants were less than 30 years of age, 33.8% were between 30 and 40, 9.5% were between 40 and 50, and 17.6% were between 50 and 60. Additionally, 85.1% of participants were employed full-time, 9.5% were employed part-time, and 5.4% were not employed.

Manipulation

This study consisted of two phases. Phase One examined Hypotheses 1-4 using a variation of Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) procedure. In this phase, participants were asked to think of a position to which they had applied or were considering applying. Once participants had identified such a position, they were presented with three procedural justice items assessing the degree to which they felt that (1) the tool provided them the opportunity to perform, (2) the tool had a justified use, and (3) the tool invaded their privacy for résumés, LinkedIn, and Facebook separately (Appendix B). Participants were also asked to respond to 15 organizational attraction items assessing their (1) level of general attraction, (2) intentions to pursue, and (3) perceptions of the organization's prestige, based on the organization's use of résumés, LinkedIn, or Facebook in the recruitment and selection process (see Appendix C). To reduce order effects, the presentation of each set of items was randomized so all participants received each of the 18 items for résumés, LinkedIn, and Facebook, but did not receive each tool (i.e., résumés, LinkedIn, Facebook) in the same order.

After completing Phase One all participants proceeded to Phase Two, which examined the fifth hypothesis and contained three treatment levels: LinkedIn absent, which contained no mention of LinkedIn; LinkedIn active, in which an individual was contacted by an organizational representative regarding an open position; and LinkedIn passive, in which it was suggested by an organization that an individual follow the organization on LinkedIn upon viewing a job advertisement. This was accomplished using vignettes; one vignette to describe each treatment level (see Appendix D). To maximize the fidelity of the LinkedIn active vignette, it used the piped text feature in Qualtrics. The piped text feature inserted the participants' name or pseudonym and desired job title into the vignette (see Appendix D). Additionally, the LinkedIn active vignette was modeled after an actual LinkedIn recruitment message, and the LinkedIn

passive and LinkedIn absent vignette used the same structure, omitting the LinkedIn message from the recruiter and altering relevant details. Each vignette was followed by two items assessing participant reactions and perceptions of organizational attractiveness. To reduce order effects, the presentation of the vignettes was randomized such that participants received the vignettes in varying order.

Measures

Applicant reactions. Applicant reactions were measured with an adapted form of Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) scale. Each applicant reaction was measured with one item. Items consisted of, "This selection method allows me the opportunity to perform," "I believe that the organization is justified in using this method for selection," and "This selection method invades my privacy," and measured applicant reactions of opportunity to perform, justification for method, and invasion of privacy, respectfully. Items used a 5-point response scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Additionally, there was a single item, "Overall, based on the scenario described above, how favorable or unfavorable would your reaction be toward that organization?" to assess participant overall reaction (see Appendix E).

Organizational attraction. The organizational attraction variables were measured using Highhouse et al. (2003) Organizational Attraction scale. This scale is comprised of the following three 5-item subscales: Company Attractiveness ($\alpha = .61 - .82$), containing items such as, "A job at this company would be very appealing to me"; Intentions to Pursue ($\alpha = .84 - .94$), containing items such as, "I would accept a job offer from this company"; and Prestige ($\alpha = .80 - .94$), containing items such as, "Employees are probably proud to work at this company." Items used a 5-point response scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*) and are included in Appendix C. The additional item, "Based on the scenario described above, how

would you rate the company's attractiveness?" was used to assess participants' overall perceptions of an organization's attractiveness.

LinkedIn usage. Three items created for this study were used to assess participants' LinkedIn usage. One item asked, "Do you use LinkedIn?" and used a binary (*Yes/No*) response scale. If the response to the first question was "yes," the following two questions were presented: "How often do you use LinkedIn?" and "How much time do you usually spend on LinkedIn during a single session of continuous use?" The frequency item used a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*Once a month*) to 5 (*> once a day*). The duration item used a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*< 15 minutes*) to 5 (*> 60 minutes*). These two items were assessed separately. If the answer to the LinkedIn usage was "no," participants were not asked the frequency and duration questions but instead proceeded directly to the demographic items.

LinkedIn profile strength. Two items developed for this study were used to assess profile strength. The first item, "How strong do you consider your LinkedIn profile to be?", gauged the perceived strength of participants' profiles. This item used a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*very weak*) to 5 (*very strong*). The second item asked, "How many LinkedIn connections do you have?" and was responded to on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*< 99*) to 6 (*> 500*). The responses to these two items were summed to create an overall LinkedIn profile strength score.

Demographics. Items measured age, gender, race, ethnicity, and employment status. Using a write-in response format for age allowed for inclusivity. Likewise, the gender item included responses of "Male," "Female," "Non-binary," and "Prefer not to respond." The race and ethnicity items also had a "Prefer not to respond" response option. The employment status item, as well as the other demographic items, were used to describe the sample. These items are included in Appendix F.

Procedure

The current study received Exempt approval from Xavier University's Institutional Review Board (IRB; see Appendix G). Participants were anonymous and received no exposure to any sort of physical or emotional harm. The researcher did not identify participants based on their responses, and participants were not asked to provide any identifying information beyond that necessary for demographic and compensation purposes. Information collected for compensation purposes was limited to participants' MTurk worker ID number. Furthermore, identifying information was not linked to participants. For compensation purposes, upon completion of the study survey, participants were provided with a completion code that they entered into MTurk to verify their completion of the study survey. Additionally, two quality check items were dispersed throughout the survey to ensure that participants were paying attention while completing the survey (e.g., "Please select 'Strongly disagree' for this question"). If the participant failed either quality check item, their HIT was be rejected, they did not receive compensation, and their data were deleted prior to analysis.

To test Hypothesis 1-4, Phase One contained a total of 18 items; three items assessed procedural justice and 15 items assessed organizational attractiveness. Each of the 18 items were administered three times, once regarding perceptions of résumés, once regarding perceptions of LinkedIn, and once regarding perceptions of Facebook when used in the recruitment and selection process, for a total of 54 items. The presentation of these items was counterbalanced to reduce order effects. To test Hypothesis 5, Phase Two contained two items each administered three times, once for each vignette (i.e., LinkedIn absent, LinkedIn active, LinkedIn passive), for a total of six items. These vignettes in were counterbalanced to reduce order effects. The terms of participation and receiving payment were explained in the recruitment posting (see Appendix A)

as well as the informed consent form (see Appendix H). Directions stated that participants must have responded to all required items before they were provided with the survey completion code. The contact information of the researcher was provided in the informed consent page (see Appendix H) should participants have had any questions or concerns regarding the study.

The study survey was computerized and available online for interested participants to complete. This allowed participants to complete the study at a time that was convenient for them. To maintain anonymity, links to the study survey were posted in MTurk. Upon following the link, participants were presented with the informed consent form (see Appendix H). Participants were then prompted to answer two items regarding a pseudonym and desired job title (see Appendix I). These two items were used to maximize the fidelity of the LinkedIn active vignette. Responses to these two items were deleted immediately after the data was downloaded. Once those items were completed, participants were asked to respond to the three items assessing their perception regarding opportunity to perform, justification, and invasion of privacy for résumés, LinkedIn, and Facebook. Then, participants were presented with the second set of items assessing their attraction to, pursuit intentions regarding, and prestige perception of an organization using the methods listed above. Following this, it was suggested that participants open their LinkedIn for reference purposes. Participants were then presented with the three vignettes describing LinkedIn absent recruitment, LinkedIn active recruitment, and LinkedIn passive recruitment, each of which were followed by two items, one assessing their overall reactions and one assessing their overall perceived organizational attractiveness (see Appendix E). Once participants had completed each item associated with the vignettes, they were presented with the LinkedIn profile strength, LinkedIn usage, and demographic item blocks successively.

Survey completion time averaged less than 10 minutes. Participants were then provided with their survey completion code to obtain their compensation of \$1.50 and thanked for their time.

Chapter IV

Results

To determine whether there were significant differences in applicant reactions when using SNSs in the recruitment and selection process, three one-way repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted. The correlations between the applicant reaction variables have been provided in Table 1. The first ANOVA demonstrated significant differences in perceived opportunity to perform among the three recruitment and selection methods, Wilks's $\lambda = .603$, $F(2, 68) = 22.39$, $p < .001$. Follow up paired comparisons indicated that applicants reacted more positively regarding opportunity to perform when LinkedIn ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.05$) was used in the recruitment and selection process as opposed to Facebook ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.45$), $t(69) = 5.38$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.60, 1.31], Cohen's $d = .64$, providing support for Hypothesis 1a.

Additionally, follow up paired comparisons indicated that applicants reacted differently concerning opportunity to perform when LinkedIn was compared to no SNS (i.e., résumés) in the recruitment and selection process. Specifically, applicants reacted more positively when no SNS ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.88$) was used than when LinkedIn ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.05$) was used in the recruitment and selection process $t(69) = -2.71$, $p = .009$, 95% CI [-0.55, -0.08], Cohen's $d = .32$, providing support for Hypothesis 2a.

The second ANOVA revealed significant differences among the three recruitment and selection methods regarding perceived justification, Wilks's $\lambda = .551$, $F(2, 68) = 27.07$, $p < .001$. Results for Hypothesis 1b indicated that applicants reacted more positively

Table 1

Correlation Matrix for Applicant Reaction Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. LinkedIn – Opportunity									
2. LinkedIn – Justification	.45**								
3. LinkedIn – Privacy	-.15	-.37**							
4. Facebook – Opportunity	.33**	.11	.41**						
5. Facebook – Justification	.10	.17	.35**	.66**					
6. Facebook – Privacy	-.06	-.17	.10	-.16	-.46**				
7. Résumé – Opportunity	.50**	.12	-.03	.16	.10	.08			
8. Résumé – Justification	.27*	.34**	-.27*	.01	-.05	.03	.49**		
9. Résumé – Privacy	.08	-.08	.68**	.48**	.38**	-.01	.07	-.33**	

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

regarding perceived justification when LinkedIn ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.09$) rather than when Facebook ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.53$) was used in the recruitment and selection process, $t(69) = 7.07$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [1.05, 1.87], Cohen's $d = .85$, providing support for Hypothesis 1b.

On the other hand, applicants did not react differently regarding perceived justification when the use of LinkedIn ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.09$) was compared to the use of no SNS ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.97$) in the recruitment and selection process, $t(69) = -0.81$, $p = .423$, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.17], Cohen's $d = .10$; hence, Hypothesis 2b was not supported.

A third ANOVA found significant differences among the three recruitment and selection methods in regards to perceived invasion of privacy, Wilks's $\lambda = .546$, $F(2, 68) = 28.29$, $p < .001$. Recall that a higher score on this item is indicative of more negative applicant perceptions. Planned follow up paired comparisons analyses indicated that applicants reacted more positively regarding invasion of privacy when LinkedIn ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.44$) was used in the recruitment and selection process than when Facebook ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.38$) was used, $t(69) = -6.11$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-1.84, -0.93], Cohen's $d = .73$, which provided support for Hypothesis 1c.

Additionally, planned follow up paired comparisons revealed that applicants reacted differently regarding invasion of privacy when LinkedIn was compared to no SNS (i.e., résumés). Specifically, applicants reacted more positively when no SNS ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 1.37$) was used than when LinkedIn ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.44$) was used in the recruitment and selection process $t(69) = 2.85$, $p = .006$, 95% CI [0.12, 0.66], Cohen's $d = .34$, providing support for Hypothesis 2c.

To determine whether there were significant differences in organizational attractiveness, three one-way repeated measures ANOVAs were conducted to analyze Hypotheses 3 and 4. The

correlations between the organizational attraction variables can be found in Table 2. The first ANOVA found differences among general attractiveness of an organization based on the SNSs used for recruitment and selection, Wilks's $\lambda = .604$, $F(2, 68) = 22.32$, $p < .001$. Follow up paired comparisons indicated that applicants had significantly higher levels of general attraction to organizations that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.77$, $SD = 3.70$) for recruitment and selection compared to Facebook ($M = 15.43$, $SD = 4.89$), $t(69) = 6.54$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [3.02, 5.67], Cohen's $d = .77$, supporting Hypothesis 3a. Additional paired comparisons revealed that applicants had significantly different levels of general attraction to organizations that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.77$, $SD = 3.70$) for recruitment and selection compared to organizations that used no SNS ($M = 18.66$, $SD = 3.21$), $t(69) = 2.62$, $p = .011$, 95% CI [0.27, 1.96], Cohen's $d = .31$, providing support for Hypothesis 4a.

The second Repeated Measures ANOVA discovered that applicants' pursuit intentions of a job were significantly different based on the use of SNSs for recruitment and selection, Wilks's $\lambda = .634$, $F(2, 68) = 19.61$, $p < .001$. Follow up paired comparisons indicated that applicants had significantly higher pursuit intentions regarding an organization that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.87$, $SD = 3.24$) for recruitment and selection as opposed to Facebook ($M = 15.96$, $SD = 6.25$), $t(69) = 5.94$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [2.60, 5.23], Cohen's $d = .71$ which provided support for Hypothesis 3b. However, additional follow up paired comparisons revealed that applicants did not have significantly different levels of pursuit intentions regarding an organization that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.87$, $SD = 3.24$) for recruitment and selection compared to organizations that used no SNS ($M = 20.17$, $SD = 3.50$), $t(69) = -.91$, $p = .367$, 95% CI [-0.96, 0.36] Cohen's $d = .11$; hence, Hypothesis 4b was not supported.

Table 2

Correlation Matrix for Organizational Attraction Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Attraction – LinkedIn	(.82)								
2. Attraction – Facebook	.19	(.72)							
3. Attraction – Résumé	.48**	.45**	(.61)						
4. Prestige – LinkedIn	.80**	.34**	.59**	(.84)					
5. Prestige – Facebook	.32**	.87**	.49**	.45**	(.94)				
6. Prestige – Résumé	.51**	.34**	.82**	.67**	.46**	(.87)			
7. Pursuit Intentions – LinkedIn	.85**	.33**	.56**	.84**	.45**	.58**	(.80)		
8. Pursuit Intentions – Facebook	.36**	.89**	.53**	.49**	.90**	.48**	.47**	(.94)	
9. Pursuit Intentions – Résumé	.56**	.31*	.80**	.58**	.41**	.86**	.67**	.44**	(.84)

Note. Coefficient alphas are represented within parentheses along the diagonal** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

The third Repeated Measures ANOVA discovered that applicants' perceived prestige of an organization was significantly different based on the use of SNSs for recruitment and selection, Wilks's $\lambda = .640$, $F(2, 68) = 19.14$, $p < .001$. Specifically, follow up paired comparisons indicated that applicants had significantly higher prestige perceptions of an organization that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.81$, $SD = 3.44$) for recruitment and selection compared to Facebook ($M = 15.91$, $SD = 5.96$), $t(69) = 6.07$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [2.62, 5.18], Cohen's $d = .73$, providing support for Hypothesis 3c. In contrast, paired comparisons did not reveal that applicants had significantly different perceptions of the prestige regarding an organization that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.81$, $SD = 3.44$) for recruitment and selection compared to an organization that used no SNS ($M = 19.73$, $SD = 3.94$), $t(69) = .24$, $p = .812$, 95% CI [-0.63, 0.80], Cohen's $d = .03$; thus, Hypothesis 4c was not supported.

To determine the effect the level of LinkedIn recruitment (i.e., active, passive) had on applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness, Hypothesis 5 was analyzed using paired samples t -tests. Contrary to Hypothesis 5a, which predicted more favorable reactions when using a passive approach, active LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.77$) resulted in significantly more favorable applicant reactions than passive LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.96$), $t(69) = 3.69$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.19, 0.64], Cohen's $d = .44$, ; hence, Hypothesis 5a was not supported. Similarly, active LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.91$) was associated with significantly higher organizational attractiveness than passive LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 0.95$), $t(69) = 2.89$, $p = .005$, 95% CI [.10, .53], Cohen's $d = .35$; consequently, Hypothesis 5b was not supported.

Supplemental Analyses

An additional Repeated Measures ANOVA discovered that applicant reactions were significantly different based on type of LinkedIn recruitment, Wilks's $\lambda = .830$, $F(2, 68) = 6.943$, $p = .002$. Paired comparisons revealed that active LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.96$) was associated with significantly higher applicant reactions than LinkedIn absent recruitment ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.82$), $t(69) = -2.15$, $p = .035$, 95% CI [-0.50, -0.02], Cohen's $d = .26$.

To examine the relationship applicant age had with applicant reactions (i.e., opportunity to perform, perceived justification, perceived invasion of privacy) and organizational attraction (i.e., general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, perceived prestige) when LinkedIn was used in the recruitment and selection process, age was dichotomized into less than or equal to 35 ($N = 38$) and greater than 35 ($N = 32$) to create equal sample sizes and allow for meaningful comparisons. The dichotomized age variable was entered into a one-way MANOVA with the six applicant reaction and organizational attraction variables as dependent measures. Applicant age did not produce significant differences in either of the applicant reaction or organizational attraction dependent measures, Wilks's $\lambda = .894$, $F(6, 63) = 1.24$, $p = .299$.

To examine the relationship perceived profile strength had with applicant reactions (i.e., opportunity to perform, perceived justification, perceived invasion of privacy) and organizational attraction (i.e., general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, perceived prestige) when LinkedIn was used in the recruitment and selection process, perceived LinkedIn profile strength was dichotomized into less than or equal to four ($N = 35$) and greater than four ($N = 35$) to create equal sample sizes and allow for meaningful comparisons. The LinkedIn profile strength variable consisted of two items, one assessing the applicant's perceived strength on a 5-point scale and one assessing the applicant's number of connections on a 5-point scale. Thus, the LinkedIn

profile strength score ranged from 2 to 11. The dichotomized perceived LinkedIn profile strength variable was entered into a one-way MANOVA with the six applicant reaction and organizational attraction variables as dependent measures. This analysis discovered significant differences among the dependent measures, Wilks's $\lambda = .737$, $F(6, 63) = 3.751$, $p = .003$. Planned follow up paired comparisons indicated that when concerned with opportunity to perform, applicants with higher LinkedIn profile strength perceptions ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.73$) had significantly more favorable reactions than applicants with lower LinkedIn profile strength perceptions ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 1.25$), $F(1, 68) = 4.45$, $p = .039$, $\eta^2 = .06$. Similarly, regarding perceived prestige, applicants with higher LinkedIn profile strength perceptions ($M = 21.00$, $SD = 2.57$) had significantly higher scores than applicants with lower LinkedIn profile strength perceptions ($M = 18.63$, $SD = 3.80$), $F(1, 68) = 9.34$, $p = .003$, $\eta^2 = .12$. Additionally, higher pursuit intention scores were found for applicants with higher LinkedIn profile strength perceptions ($M = 20.97$, $SD = 2.46$) applicants with lower LinkedIn profile strength perceptions ($M = 18.77$, $SD = 3.58$), $F(1, 68) = 8.98$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .12$.

Chapter V

Discussion

This study investigated the impact LinkedIn has on applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness in the recruitment and selection process. There were two phases that every participant completed. Phase One explored specific facets of applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness with the use or absence of different SNSs (LinkedIn, Facebook, and résumé), and Phase Two examined overall applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness based on the nature of LinkedIn use in the recruitment and selection process.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that applicant reactions would be more positive with the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process as opposed to Facebook based on (a) opportunity to perform, (b) perceived justification, and (c) invasion of privacy. Full support for Hypothesis 1 indicated that applicants felt that the use of LinkedIn, as opposed to Facebook, allowed them more of an opportunity to perform, was more justified, and invaded their privacy to a lesser extent. These results suggest that organizations should use LinkedIn instead of Facebook for recruitment and selection purposes when concerned with applicant reactions. According to Jobvite (2018) it appears that many organizations already rely more on LinkedIn for recruitment, as 77% of recruiters use LinkedIn whereas 63% use Facebook. However, based on a comparison to previous Jobvite surveys (Jobvite, 2016), this preference for LinkedIn seems to be shifting in favor of Facebook.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that applicant reactions would be different when recruitment and selection involved LinkedIn compared to no SNS based on (a) opportunity to perform, (b) perceived justification, and (c) invasion of privacy; Hypothesis 2 received mixed support. Results indicated support for Hypothesis 2a and 2c, finding that no SNS (i.e., résumé) allowed participants more of an opportunity to perform than LinkedIn and that the use of LinkedIn invaded their privacy to a higher degree than the use of no SNS. However, Hypothesis 2b was not supported, indicating that applicants perceived the use of LinkedIn and no SNS in the recruitment and selection process as equally justified. The results may indicate that LinkedIn can be considered as an extended online résumé regarding perceived justification. Otherwise, the results of this study suggest that résumés may be perceived as more favorable than LinkedIn in terms of a better opportunity to perform and lower invasion of privacy.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that organizational attractiveness would be higher with the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process as opposed to Facebook based on (a) general attractiveness, (b) pursuit intentions, and (c) perceived prestige. As predicted, participants reported significant differences between the use of LinkedIn and Facebook, with LinkedIn consistently generating higher ratings than Facebook on all three organizational attractiveness facets. Full support for Hypothesis 3 suggests that applicants perceived organizations that used LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process as more attractive, more worthy of pursuit, and more prestigious than those that used Facebook.

In Hypotheses 1 and 3, LinkedIn was viewed more positively than Facebook on all of the facets of applicant reactions (opportunity to perform, justification, and invasion of privacy) and organizational attractiveness (general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, and prestige). These results in favor of LinkedIn substantiate previous findings that applicants perceive LinkedIn as

better suited than Facebook for recruitment and selection (Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Nikolaou, 2014). LinkedIn's favorability is likely because applicants view it as a pSNS, intended to help applicants progress in their careers by connecting them with other professionals, including recruiters. In contrast, applicants consider Facebook a rSNS, primarily used to allow individuals to share information with their non-professional network. Based on the intended use of LinkedIn and Facebook, the two SNSs contain and focus on different content. For instance, LinkedIn focuses on an individual's work and education history, career goals and accomplishments, and occupational skills. All of this content available on LinkedIn is relevant to one's job and professional life. However, Facebook focuses on events in an individual's day-to-day social life and activities they engage in with their friends and family. As such, much of the content available on Facebook may not be appropriate for a professional setting.

Due to these differences between Facebook and LinkedIn, applicants may not perceive Facebook as providing them with the opportunity to perform because they do not post content representative of their behavior at work on Facebook; in contrast, they do post such content on LinkedIn. Similarly, applicants may perceive Facebook as less justified than LinkedIn because their intended audience on Facebook is not their professional network, although it is on LinkedIn. Because applicants do not post content for their professional network on Facebook, they may consider such content private and perceive it as an invasion of privacy if viewed by an organization. According to the theory of reasoned action, these more negative applicant reactions to the use of Facebook compared to LinkedIn likely lead to the observed lower scores on the organizational attractiveness facets.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that organizational attractiveness would be significantly different with the use of LinkedIn as opposed to no SNS. Hypothesis 4a was supported in favor of

LinkedIn, indicating that applicants found organizations that used LinkedIn as generally more attractive than organizations that used no SNS. In contrast, Hypotheses 4b and 4c were not supported, suggesting that the use of LinkedIn compared to the use of no SNS did not influence applicants' pursuit intentions nor their perception of an organization's prestige. These findings suggest that using LinkedIn as opposed to no SNS (i.e., résumés) may be beneficial to an organization's general attractiveness, but not for their pursuit intentions or prestige.

The results of Hypotheses 2 and 4 that compared LinkedIn to no SNS are interesting as they do not provide a definitive answer as to whether applicants prefer LinkedIn to no SNS. The more positive reactions to the use of no SNS regarding opportunity to perform (i.e., Hypothesis 2a) and invasion of privacy (i.e., Hypothesis 2c) could be related to the amount of information available on LinkedIn versus résumés. LinkedIn contains more information than a résumé and cannot be tailored to a specific position. Therefore, an applicant cannot be selective with the information they feel allows them the best opportunity to perform for any given position when using LinkedIn. Furthermore, when applying to a job, an applicant expects an organization to view their résumé, as this is generally the primary way in which an organization gains access to an applicant's résumé. However, this is not the case with LinkedIn as an individual's LinkedIn profile can be found online, unbeknownst to them, whether they apply or not. The lack of explicit applicant awareness associated with a LinkedIn profile may contribute to the more negative applicant reactions regarding invasion of privacy. In contrast to Hypotheses 2a and 2c, participants did not react in a significantly different way to the justification of LinkedIn and no SNS in Hypothesis 2b, which may be due to the similar purpose of the content provided on LinkedIn and résumés.

The results regarding organizational attractiveness when using LinkedIn versus no SNS (i.e., Hypothesis 4) seem to violate the theory of reasoned action, specifically concerning general attractiveness (i.e., Hypothesis 4a). The pattern of results for Hypothesis 2 suggests that applicants prefer no SNS to LinkedIn. However, the pattern of results for Hypothesis 4 suggests applicants prefer LinkedIn to no SNS as the only significant result was obtained for general attractiveness in favor of LinkedIn. The favorability of LinkedIn concerning organizational attractiveness may imply the presence of a moderator. The moderator in this relationship could be that organizations that use LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process are perceived to be more progressive as LinkedIn is a relatively new technology. With this moderator, participants may have perceived an organization that used LinkedIn as generally more attractive, although not more worthy of pursuit nor prestige perceptions.

Hypothesis 5 examined overall applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness based on the nature of LinkedIn use in the recruitment and selection process. It was predicted that less favorable reactions would occur with an active approach, in which an applicant was directly contacted through LinkedIn, than with a passive approach, in which the organization suggested the applicant connect with the organization through LinkedIn (Hypothesis 5a). It was also predicted that lower organizational attractiveness would occur with an active approach than with a passive approach (Hypothesis 5b). Instead, Hypotheses 5a and 5b were significant in the opposite direction than was predicted, indicating that applicants reacted more favorably and were more attracted to organizations that engaged in active LinkedIn recruitment than passive LinkedIn recruitment.

Although the results from Hypothesis 5 contradict Hypotheses 2a and 2c in that LinkedIn received more positive overall ratings yet received more negative ratings regarding opportunity

to perform and invasion of privacy, they may be a result of the desirability of the position referred to in the communication. Because the position about which the participant was contacted may have been attractive, the applicant may have found it acceptable for the organizational representative to view their profile, and thus justified the practice as acceptable and not an invasion of privacy. Furthermore, the applicant could reason that their LinkedIn profile allowed them the opportunity to perform; otherwise, they would not have been contacted. Therefore, the viewing of a participant's profile and subsequent contact by an organizational representative may not have resulted in perceiving a violation of any of Gilliland's (1993) or Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) organizational justice rules, and thus was not detrimental to an organization's attractiveness.

Overall, this study contributes to the literature regarding the use of SNSs in recruitment and selection by confirming and extending previous findings that LinkedIn receives more positive applicant reactions than Facebook (e.g., Aguado et al., 2016), but also finding that the use of LinkedIn leads to fewer positive applicant reactions than no SNS (i.e., résumés) during recruitment. Previous studies (e.g., Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Nikolaou, 2014) have examined perceptions of LinkedIn in comparison to Facebook, but only from an overall perspective, not based on specific applicant reactions or organizational attractiveness facets. When investigating those facets, this study discovered that LinkedIn is preferable to Facebook on the applicant reaction dimensions of opportunity to perform, justification, and invasion of privacy. Further, LinkedIn elicited higher ratings than Facebook on the organizational attractiveness dimensions of general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, and prestige.

On the other hand, the findings concerning the comparison of LinkedIn to no SNS (i.e., résumés) provide mixed support for the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process. Three of these six hypotheses found no significant difference between LinkedIn and no SNS. However, two of the hypotheses favored no SNS, whereas one favored LinkedIn. Specifically, applicants reported feeling they had more of an opportunity to perform and perceived lower levels of invasion of privacy with no SNS than with LinkedIn. In contrast, the use of LinkedIn elicited higher general attractiveness ratings than no SNS. This pattern of results implies that, overall, the use of no SNS may be preferable to the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process. Nevertheless, the higher general attractiveness ratings of organizations that used LinkedIn could stem from a social presence, as discussed by Carpentier et al. (2017), in which organizations were perceived as more attractive by merely having a presence on social media. This organizational social presence may even be a sign that the organization is progressive and is adopting new technology.

Additionally, this was the first study to explicitly investigate reactions to different recruitment practices using LinkedIn (i.e., active versus passive). The findings in this study indicate that actively using LinkedIn for recruitment and selection is associated with more positive applicant reactions and higher organizational attractiveness than passively using LinkedIn. The findings of Hypothesis 5 may have been a result of the position being attractive to the participant. If so, the applicant may not have perceived the actions to have violated any organizational justice rules and subsequently not negatively influenced organizational attraction. For now, it appears that if an organization uses LinkedIn in recruitment and selection, it should take an active approach.

Future Research

The current research findings suggest multiple avenues for future research. Concerning the initial hypotheses, one question pertains to the apparent disconnect between applicant reactions regarding opportunity to perform and invasion of privacy with perceived general attractiveness. If applicant reactions are positively related to organizational attractiveness, one might expect the same positive relationship with these constructs; however, this was not the case. Applicants preferred no SNS to LinkedIn regarding both the opportunity to perform and invasion of privacy dimensions of applicant reactions, yet rated an organization that used LinkedIn for recruitment and selection higher on general attractiveness. The finding that applicants react more negatively to LinkedIn than no SNS (i.e., résumés) may be related to the fact that LinkedIn contains more information and cannot be tailored to specific positions in the same way that traditional résumés can. Given it is a recent technological development, the use of LinkedIn may be perceived as progressive, thus increasing applicants' perception of the organization's general attractiveness. Sivertzen et al.'s (2017; as cited in Carpentier et al., 2017) finding that exposure to organizational information on social media increases corporate reputation may inform this inquiry indirectly, as that research was not in the context of recruitment and selection. Thus, investigating the connection between organizational social presence and the perception of an organization being progressive may prove useful in this context.

An additional area of future research is the mechanism facilitating applicant's perceptions of LinkedIn as a pSNS (i.e., an SNS intended for professional networking as opposed to recreational networking; Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Chiang & Suen, 2015), yet those same applicants perceived LinkedIn's use as more of an invasion of privacy than the use of no SNS. This finding seems to contradict Chiang and Suen's (2015) finding that applicants perceived their LinkedIn profile as an online résumé. However, as previously

mentioned, the amount and nature of information on a LinkedIn profile could influence the discrepancy between perceptions of LinkedIn and no SNS. In general, résumés are limited to two pages and are tailored to a specific position, whereas LinkedIn does not have a length constraint and cannot easily be altered to fit a specific position. Because of these differences between LinkedIn and résumés, résumés usually only contain a subset of the information available on LinkedIn. For example, an applicant may omit a position or skill from their résumé that is not relevant for the position to which they are applying to save space but include all positions and skills on LinkedIn. LinkedIn also contains information fields that are not typically available on résumés, such as connections, skill endorsements, interests, and links to additional material. Therefore, there is likely to be substantially more information available on LinkedIn, not all of which an applicant intends for a specific employer to see. Investigating the linkage between the discrepancy in perceptions and the amount of information on LinkedIn compared to résumés would benefit from additional research.

Another possible factor contributing to perceptions of invasion of privacy with the use of LinkedIn could be that résumés typically cannot be found and accessed unbeknownst to an applicant. In contrast, LinkedIn profiles can be accessed by just about anyone, depending on the profile's privacy and account settings. Because the applicant is not necessarily aware of an organization looking at their LinkedIn profile, applicants could perceive such an action as an invasion of privacy. Future research should explore why and to what extent applicants perceive the use of LinkedIn as an invasion of privacy.

Additional investigations could also explore whether positive applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness occur with active LinkedIn recruitment for an undesirable position. In Phase Two, participants were presented with vignettes describing recruitment using LinkedIn

actively, passively, or not at all and asked to indicate their overall reactions as well as their overall perceptions of the organization's attractiveness. The positions referred to in the vignettes were designed to be attractive to the participant as they were for the next job they were looking for and offered a full benefits package, comprehensive training program, and advancement opportunities. If the position was not attractive, applicants might have perceived the organization to have violated one or more of Gilliland (1993) or Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) organizational justice rules, which may have evoked more negative applicant reactions and lower organizational attractiveness perceptions. Therefore, future research should investigate position attractiveness as a moderator of applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness.

Limitations

One possible limitation of this study is insufficient effort responding in which participants may not have been motivated to complete a survey correctly (Huang, Curran, Keeney, Poposki, & DeShon, 2012). In this study, the participant was given the discretion as to where they completed the survey. Therefore, the environment was likely different for each participant. There could have been numerous distractions and other factors that could have led to insufficient effort responding. There is no practical way to ensure avoidance of this limitation short of conducting the study in a standardized or controlled setting. Doing so would have removed potential distractions, thus indirectly discouraging insufficient effort responding. However, survey instructions asked participants to remove or minimize possible distractions to reduce the effects of this limitation. Additionally, a majority of the items in the survey required a response before the participant could proceed to the next set of items. The survey also contained two attention check items to detect insufficient effort responding, and less than 10 percent of

participants failed one or more of the attention checks. Thus, insufficient effort responding was not likely a significant issue in this study.

A second possible limitation of this study is the use of vignettes. Vignettes are brief descriptions of a person or situation containing detailed references regarding the most critical factors in the judgment-making process of respondents (Alexander & Becker, 1978). Criticisms of vignettes include them being artificial and not sufficiently illustrative of real-world phenomena but, if used correctly, they can maximize internal validity (Evans et al., 2015). The LinkedIn active vignette was modeled after an actual LinkedIn recruitment message, and the LinkedIn passive and LinkedIn absent vignette used the same structure, omitting the LinkedIn message and altering relevant details. Furthermore, the LinkedIn active vignette used the participants' provided name and desired employment opportunity to increase the fidelity of the vignette. Thus, the vignettes used in this study were sufficiently illustrative of real-world phenomena and an acceptable methodology in this study.

An additional possible limitation of this study is the use of self-report measures of participant LinkedIn information. Research participants tend to respond to items in a way that reflects positively on them (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002). In this case, it may be that participants overestimated their number of LinkedIn connections because norms imply that having more LinkedIn connections is a positive attribute. Whereas this issue could apply to the question regarding profile strength, it is not actually a limitation of the profile strength item because that item is inherently subjective, as it is attempting to gauge how participants evaluate their own profile. The study instructions also suggested that participants have their LinkedIn profiles available for the portion of the survey that collected information about their LinkedIn profile to minimize the impact of this limitation. Offering participants the opportunity to refer to

their profile should have increased the accuracy of both LinkedIn profile strength items even though the profile strength item was subjective.

A further limitation is that the general attraction, pursuit intentions, and prestige subdimensions of organizational attraction are highly correlated. Thus, using these organizational attraction dimensions as dependent measures in a MANOVA may not have been the most appropriate statistical approach for the exploratory analysis regarding organizational attraction and age, and organizational attraction and perceived LinkedIn profile strength. Nevertheless, the significant results regarding the relationship between perceived LinkedIn profile strength and pursuit intentions is a relevant finding that contributes to the literature regarding the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process.

Conclusion

This study investigated applicant reactions to and organizational attraction with the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process. It replicated the results of previous studies (e.g., Aguado et al., 2016; Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Nikolaou, 2014) by confirming that applicants prefer the use of LinkedIn to the use of Facebook in recruitment and selection. Additionally, this study extended those findings by comparing LinkedIn to no SNS (i.e., résumés) and explored how applicants react to specific uses of LinkedIn (i.e., active versus passive). The results regarding LinkedIn versus no SNS provided mixed support for using LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process. Applicants preferred no SNS to LinkedIn when evaluating perceived opportunity to perform and invasion of privacy. In contrast, the use of LinkedIn evoked more positive organizational attractiveness perceptions than the use of no SNS regarding general attractiveness. The results of the current study also imply that applicants prefer active LinkedIn recruitment to passive LinkedIn recruitment, suggesting that if organizations are

going to use social media in recruitment and selection, they should use LinkedIn. Finally, future research should explore position attractiveness as well as perceptions of the organization's progressive nature as moderators of the relationship between active LinkedIn recruitment and applicant reactions, and LinkedIn recruitment and organizational attractiveness.

Chapter VI

Summary

Social Networking Sites (SNSs; e.g., LinkedIn, Facebook) have experienced rapid growth over the last decade. With the expansion of SNSs, a Jobvite survey estimated that 92% of recruiters use SNSs as a recruitment tool (Chambers & Winter, 2017) as SNSs are perceived to be valuable by providing recruiters with additional opportunities for applicant attraction (Nikolaou, 2014) and information gathering (Caers & Castelyns, 2011). Nevertheless, the relationship between SNS use in recruitment and selection, applicant reactions, and organizational attractiveness is not well understood.

The relationship between SNS use in recruitment and selection, applicant reactions, and organizational attractiveness may be related to whether the SNS used is a professional SNS (pSNS) or a recreational SNS (rSNS). A pSNS intends to help individuals find career opportunities and advance their careers by connecting with other professionals (Kluemper et al., 2016). In contrast, an rSNS intends to allow individuals to share information with their non-professional (i.e., personal, recreational) network (Kluemper et al., 2016). Of the professional networks, LinkedIn is the most widely used pSNS, and Facebook is the most widely used rSNS in the United States (Smith & Anderson, 2018). This categorization of LinkedIn and Facebook received support in previous studies, which found LinkedIn as better suited than Facebook for a multitude of professionally-oriented activities (Caers & Castelyns, 2011; Nikolaou, 2014).

However, no study has directly investigated the relationship the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process has with applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness.

When using LinkedIn as a recruitment tool, one can take a passive or active approach. Passive LinkedIn recruitment entails the organization suggesting that applicants connect with an organization through LinkedIn. In contrast, active LinkedIn recruitment refers to an organization directly contacting an applicant through LinkedIn regarding a job opportunity. The type of LinkedIn recruitment used may evoke different applicant reactions and perceptions of organizational attractiveness.

Gilliland (1993) and Steiner and Gilliland's (1996) organizational justice dimensions play a significant role in determining applicant reactions (Steiner & Gilliland, 1996) and are associated with crucial organizational outcomes (Gilliland, 1993; Gilliland & Steiner, 2001). A subcategory of these organizational justice dimensions is procedural justice, which is concerned with the perceived fairness of the methods used in the selection process. These procedural justice dimensions are most applicable to the use of SNSs in the recruitment and selection process. Of these procedural justice dimensions, there are three that apply to the use of SNSs in recruitment and selection: opportunity to perform, justification, and invasion of privacy. Applicants may perceive differences in their opportunity to perform, an organization's justification of use, and the degree to which their privacy was invaded based on the use of LinkedIn or other methods (i.e., Facebook, résumé) in the recruitment and selection process. Furthermore, these differences in reactions may stem from the content and intended audience of the different sources of information. Previous findings of a significant positive relationship between applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness (Anderson, Ahmed, & Costa, 2012) underscore the importance of applicant reactions.

According to the theory of reasoned action, a rational sequence of cognitions, starting with attitudes and culminating in actions, leads to behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Based on the theory of reasoned action, applicant reactions may have a relationship with organizational attractiveness. Organizational attractiveness has three dimensions consisting of general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, and prestige (Highhouse, Lievines, & Sinar, 2003). Anderson, Ahmed, and Costa (2012) found a significant positive correlation between applicant reactions based on Gilliland's (1993) procedural justice framework and organizational attractiveness grounded in Highhouse et al.'s an organizational attractiveness dimensions.

Thus, the goal of the present study is to investigate the relationship between the use of LinkedIn, including more specific uses of LinkedIn, in the recruitment and selection process, and applicant reactions and organizational attractiveness. Specifically, this study predicted that LinkedIn would receive more positive ratings than Facebook regarding applicant reactions (i.e., opportunity to perform, justification, invasion of privacy) and organizational attractiveness (i.e., general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, prestige). This study also predicted that applicant reactions (i.e., opportunity to perform, justification, invasion of privacy) and perceptions of organizational attractiveness (i.e., general attractiveness, pursuit intentions, prestige) would be different when LinkedIn was used in the recruitment and selection process as opposed to no SNS (i.e., résumé). Finally, this study predicted that overall applicant reactions and perceptions of organizational attractiveness would be more negative when organizations engage in active LinkedIn recruitment as opposed to passive LinkedIn recruitment.

Method

Participants were recruited through Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) to participate in a two-phase survey. All participants resided in the United States, had completed a minimum of 50 Human Intelligence Tests (HITs) on MTurk, and had a minimum 95% HIT acceptance rate.

In Phase One, participants asked to think of a position to which they have applied or considering applying. Once participants identified such a position, they were presented with three procedural justice items assessing the degree to which they felt that (1) the tool would provide them the opportunity to perform, (2) the tool has a justified use, and (3) the tool invades their privacy for résumés, LinkedIn, and Facebook separately. Participants were also asked to respond to 15 organizational attraction items assessing their (1) level of general attraction, (2) intentions to pursue, and (3) perceptions of the organization's prestige, based on the organization's use of résumés, LinkedIn, or Facebook in the recruitment and selection process. The presentation of each recruitment tool was randomized to reduce order effects. Phase 2 randomly presented participants with three vignettes describing LinkedIn active, LinkedIn passive, and LinkedIn absent recruitment. Each of these vignettes was followed by two items assessing overall applicant reactions and perceptions of organizational attractiveness.

Upon following the MTurk link, participants were presented with the informed consent form. Participants were then prompted to answer two items regarding their name or pseudonym and desired job title. These two items were used to maximize the fidelity of the LinkedIn active vignette. To protect participant anonymity, responses to these two items were deleted immediately after the data were downloaded. Once those items were completed, participants proceeded through Phase One and Phase Two of the survey. Following Phase Two of the survey, participants were presented with the LinkedIn profile strength, LinkedIn usage, and demographic

items successively. Participants were then provided with their survey completion code to obtain their \$1.50 compensation and thanked for their time.

Results

The results of this study indicated that participants responded more positively to the use of LinkedIn than Facebook in the recruitment and selection process regarding all three dimensions of applicant reactions. Specifically, participants reacted more positively regarding opportunity to perform when LinkedIn ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.05$) as opposed to Facebook ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.45$), $t(69) = 5.38$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.60, 1.31], Cohen's $d = .64$. Similarly, participants reacted more positively regarding perceived justification when LinkedIn ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.09$), rather than Facebook ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.53$), was used, $t(69) = 7.07$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [1.05, 1.87], Cohen's $d = .85$. Likewise, participants reacted more positively regarding invasion of privacy when LinkedIn ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.44$) was used than when Facebook ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.38$) was used, $t(69) = -6.11$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [-1.84, -0.93], Cohen's $d = .73$.

Similar results were found for all dimensions of organizational attractiveness. Specifically, participants reported significantly higher levels of general attraction to organizations that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.77$, $SD = 3.70$) for recruitment and selection compared to Facebook ($M = 15.43$, $SD = 4.89$), $t(69) = 6.54$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [3.02, 5.67], Cohen's $d = .77$. Participants also reported significantly higher pursuit intentions regarding an organization that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.87$, $SD = 3.24$) for recruitment and selection as opposed to Facebook ($M = 15.96$, $SD = 6.25$), $t(69) = 5.94$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [2.60, 5.23], Cohen's $d = .71$. Additionally, participants reported significantly higher prestige perceptions of an organization that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.81$, $SD = 3.44$) for recruitment and selection compared to Facebook ($M = 15.91$, $SD = 5.96$), $t(69) = 6.07$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [2.62, 5.18], Cohen's $d = .73$.

The results concerning applicant reactions and perceived organizational attractiveness when LinkedIn was compared to no SNS were not as straightforward. Applicant reactions regarding opportunity to perform indicated that participants reacted more positively to no SNS ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.88$) than to LinkedIn ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.05$), $t(69) = -2.71$, $p < .009$, 95% CI [-0.55, -0.08], Cohen's $d = .32$. Similarly, applicant reactions regarding invasion of privacy favored no SNS ($M = 2.06$, $SD = 1.37$) over LinkedIn ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.44$), $t(69) = 2.65$, $p = .006$, 95% CI [0.12, 0.66], Cohen's $d = .34$. However, participants did not prefer LinkedIn ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.09$) or no SNS ($M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.97$) concerning justification $t(69) = -0.81$, $p = .423$, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.17] Cohen's $d = .10$.

Perceived organizational attractiveness only reached significance regarding general attractiveness, with LinkedIn ($M = 19.77$, $SD = 3.70$) being associated with higher scores than no SNS ($M = 18.66$, $SD = 3.21$), $t(69) = 2.62$, $p = .011$, 95% CI [0.27, 1.96], Cohen's $d = .31$. Participants did not report significantly different levels of pursuit intentions regarding an organization that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.87$, $SD = 3.24$) compared to organizations that used no SNS ($M = 20.17$, $SD = 3.50$), $t(69) = -.91$, $p = .367$, 95% CI [-0.96, 0.36], Cohen's $d = .11$. Similarly, participants did not report significantly different prestige perceptions regarding an organization that used LinkedIn ($M = 19.81$, $SD = 3.44$) compared to an organization that used no SNS ($M = 19.73$, $SD = 3.94$), $t(69) = .24$, $p = .812$, 95% CI [-0.63, 0.80], Cohen's $d = .03$.

Lastly, active LinkedIn recruitment was associated with more favorable applicant reactions and higher organizational attractiveness than passive LinkedIn recruitment. Specifically, participants reported more favorable reactions to active LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.77$) than to passive LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.96$), $t(69) = 3.69$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.19, 0.64], Cohen's $d = .44$. Similarly, active LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 4.14$, SD

= 0.91) was associated with significantly higher organizational attractiveness than passive LinkedIn recruitment ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 0.95$), $t(69) = 2.89$, $p = .005$, 95% CI [.10, .53], Cohen's $d = .35$.

Discussion

These results have many implications for the use of LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process. First, this study suggests that organizations should use LinkedIn instead of Facebook for recruitment and selection purposes when concerned with applicant reactions. Furthermore, applicants perceived organizations that used LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process as more attractive, more worthy of pursuit, and more prestigious than those that used Facebook. LinkedIn's favorability is likely because applicants view it as a pSNS, intended to help progress their careers by connecting them with other professionals, including recruiters. In contrast, applicants consider Facebook an rSNS, primarily used to allow them to share information with their non-professional network.

The results obtained in this study concerning LinkedIn compared to no SNS (i.e., résumé) may indicate that LinkedIn can be considered as an extended online résumé in regards to perceived justification. Otherwise, the results of this study suggest that résumés may be perceived as more favorable in terms of a better opportunity to perform and lower invasion of privacy. Additionally, these results suggest that using LinkedIn as opposed to no SNS may be beneficial to an organization's general attractiveness, but not to their pursuit intentions or prestige. The more positive reactions to the use of no SNS regarding participant opportunity to perform and invasion of privacy could be related to the amount of information available on LinkedIn versus résumés. Furthermore, when applying to a job, an applicant expects their resume to be viewed. This is not the case with LinkedIn as an individual's LinkedIn profile can be found

online unbeknownst to them, whether they apply or not. The lack of explicit applicant awareness associated with a LinkedIn profile may contribute to the more negative applicant reactions regarding their invasion of privacy. However, the favorability of LinkedIn concerning organizational attractiveness may imply the presence of a moderator. The moderator in this relationship could be that organizations that use LinkedIn in the recruitment and selection process are perceived to be more progressive as LinkedIn is a relatively new technology. With this moderator, participants may have perceived an organization that used LinkedIn as generally more attractive, although not more worthy of pursuit nor prestigious.

Finally, the results of this study suggest that the viewing of a participant's profile and subsequent contact by an organizational representative may not result in perceiving a violation of any organizational justice rules, and thus was not detrimental to an organization's attractiveness. Although these results contradict the previously mentioned results concerning applicants' perceived opportunity to perform and invasion of privacy, they may be a result of the desirability of the position referred to in the communication.

References

- Aguado, D., Rico, R., Rubio, V. J., & Fernandez, L. (2016). Applicant reactions to social network web use in personnel selection and assessment. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 32(3), 183-190. doi: 10.1016/j.rpto.2016.001
- Alexander, C. S., & Becker, H. J. (1978). The use of vignettes in survey research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42(1), 93-104. doi: 10.1086/268432
- Anderson, N., Ahmed, S., & Costa, A. C. (2012). Applicant reactions in Saudi Arabia: Organizational attractiveness and core self-evaluation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 20(2), 197–208. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2389.2012.00592.x
- Bauer, T. N., McCarthy, J., Anderson, N., Truxillo, D. M., & Salgado, J. F. (2012). What we know about applicant reactions to selection: Research summary and best practices. *SIOP White Paper Series*. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Bowling Green, OH.
- Blacksmith, N., & Poepelman, T. (2014). Three ways social media and technology has changed recruitment. *SIOP White Paper Series*. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Bowling Green, OH.
- Bohnert, D., & Ross, W. H. (2010). The influence of social networking web sites on the evaluation of job candidates. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 13(3), 341-347. doi:10.1089/cyber.2009.0193
- Boyd, D. M., & Ellison N. B. (2008). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 210-230. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x

- Breaugh, J. A. (2013). Employee recruitment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 389-416. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143757
- Caers, R., & Castelyns, V. (2011). LinkedIn and Facebook in Belgium: The influences and biases of social network sites in recruitment and selection procedures. *Social Science Computer Review*, 29(4), 437-448. doi: 10.1177/0894439310386567
- Carpentier, M., Van Hove, G., Stockman, S., Schollaert, E., Van Theemsche, B., & Jacobs, G. (2017). Recruiting nurses through social media: Effects on employer brand and attractiveness. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 73(11), 2696-2708. doi: 10.1111/jan.13336
- Chambers, R., & Winter, J. (2017). Social media and selection: A brief history and practical recommendations. *SIOP White Paper Series*. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Bowling Green, OH.
- Chiang, J. K.-H., & Suen, H.-Y. (2015). Self-presentation and hiring recommendations in online communities: Lessons from LinkedIn. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48, 516-524. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2015.02.017
- Cober, R. T., Brown, D. J., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (2004). Recruitment on the net: How do organizational web site characteristics influence applicant attraction? *Journal of Management*, 30(5), 623-646. doi: 10.1016/j.jm.2004.03.001
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425

- Donaldson, S. I., & Grant-Vallone, E. J. (2002). Understanding self-report bias in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*(2), 245-260.
doi:10.1023/A:1019637632584
- Elias, T., Honda, L. P., Kimmel, M., & Chung, J. (2016). A mixed methods examination of 21st century hiring processes, social networking sites, and implicit bias. *The Journal of Social Media in Society, 5*(1), 189-228. Retrieved from
<http://thejsms.org/index.php/TSMRI/article/view/151>
- Evans, S. C., Roberts, M. C., Keeley J. W., Blossom, J. B., Amaro, C. M., Garcia, A. M., Stough, C. O., Canter, K. S., Robles, R., & Reed, G. M. (2015). Vignette methodologies for studying clinicians' decision-making: Validity, utility, and application in ICD-11 field studies. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 15*(2), 160-170. doi: 10.1016/j.ijchp.2014.12.001
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fisher, C. D., Ilgen, D. R., & Hoyer, W. D. (1979). Source credibility, information favorability, and job offer acceptance. *Academy of Management Journal, 22*(1), 94-103. doi: 10.2307/255481
- Gerard, J. G. (2012). Linking in with LinkedIn®: Three exercises that enhance professional social networking and career building. *Journal of Management Education, 36*(6), 866-897. doi: 10.1177/1052562911413464
- Gilliland, S. W. (1993). The perceived fairness of selection systems: An organizational justice perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 694-734. doi: 10.2307/258595

- Gilliland, S. W., & Steiner, D. D. (2001). Causes and consequences of applicant perceptions of unfairness. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Series in applied psychology. Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice* (pp. 175-195). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Guillory, J., & Hancock, J. T. (2012). The effect of LinkedIn on deception in resumes. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15(3), 135-140.
doi:10.1089/cyber.2011.0389
- Gusdorf, M. L. (2008). *Recruitment and selection: Hiring the right person*. Society for Human Resource Management, Alexandria, VA.
- Gutman, A., Koppes, L. L., & Vodanovich, S. J. (2011). *EEO law and personnel practices* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. (Chapter 1)
- Highhouse, S., Beadle, D., Gallo, A., & Miller, L. (1998). Get em while they last! Effects of scarcity information in job advertisements, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(9), 779-795. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01731.x
- Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). Measuring attraction to organizations. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 63(6), 986-1001. doi: 10.1177/0013164403258403
- Huang, J. L., Curran, P. G., Keeney, J., Poposki, E. M., & DeShon, R. P. (2012). Detecting and deterring insufficient effort responding to surveys. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(1), 99-114. doi: 10.1007/s10869-011-9231-8
- Jobvite. (2016). *Job seeker nation study 2016: Where job seekers stand on the economy, job security, and the future of work*. Retrieved on August 10, 2020, from

- https://www.jobvite.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Jobvite_Jobseeker_Nation_2016.pdf
- Jobvite. (2018). *2018 recruiter nation survey: The tipping point: The next chapter in recruiting*. Retrieved on August 10, 2020, from <https://www.jobvite.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/2018-Recruiter-Nation-Study.pdf>
- Kluemper, D. H., Mitra, A., & Wang, S. (2016). Social media use in HRM. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (pp. 153-207). West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi: 10.1108/S0742-730120160000034011
- LinkedIn. (2018). *About LinkedIn*. Retrieved on December 12, 2018, from <https://about.linkedin.com>
- Madera, J. M. (2012). Using social networking websites as a selection tool: The role of selection process fairness and job pursuit intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(4), 1276-1282. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.03.008
- Nikolaou, I. (2014). Social networking web sites in job search and employee recruitment. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 22(2), 179-189. doi: 10.1111/ijsa.12067
- Roulin, N., & Levashina, J. (2019). LinkedIn as a new selection method: Psychometric properties and assessment approach. *Personnel Psychology*, 72(2), 187-211. doi: 10.1111/peps.12296
- Sears, D. O. (1986). College sophomores in the laboratory: Influences of a narrow data base on psychology's view of human nature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(3), 515-530. doi: 10.1037/002-3514.51.3.515

- Singh, R. (1975). Information integration theory applied to expected job attractiveness and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(5), 621-623. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.60.5.621
- Slovensky, R., & Ross, W. H. (2012). Should human resource managers use social media to screen job applicants? Managerial and legal issues in the USA. *Info*, 14(1), 55-69. doi:10.1108/14636691211196941
- Smith, A., & Anderson, M. (2018). Social media use in 2018. Retrieved from Pew Internet & American Life Project website: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2018/03/01/social-media-use-in-2018>
- Steiner, D. D. & Gilliland, S. W. (1996). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in France and the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 134-141. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.134
- Stoughton, J. M., Thompson, L. F., & Meade, A. W. (2015). Examining applicant reactions to the use of social networking websites in pre-employment screening. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(1), 73-88. doi:10.1007/s10869-013-9333-6
- Turban, D. B., Forret, M. L., & Hendrickson, C. L. (1998). Applicant attraction to firms: Influences of organization reputation, job and organizational attributes, and recruiter behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 52(1), 24-44. doi: 10.1006/vjbe.1996.1555
- Van Hoya, G., van Hooft, E. A. J., & Lievens, F. (2009). Networking as a job search behaviour: A social network perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82(3), 661-682. doi: 10.1348/096317908x360675

Vroom, V. H. (1966). Organizational choice: A study of pre- and post-decision processes.

Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 1(2), 212-225. doi: 10.1016/0030-

5073(66)90013-4

Appendix A

Participant Recruitment Posting

The purpose of this study is to investigate applicant reactions to various methods used by organizations in the recruitment and selection process.

This survey consists of 60 items and should take about 15 minutes to complete, however, you will be given 1 hour to complete the study. You will be paid \$1.50 for completing the survey and answering all of the survey items. At the end of the survey you will be provided with a completion code; please enter that completion code prior to submitting the HIT. If you do not enter the completion code, then you will not be paid for your participation and your HIT will be rejected. You can only complete this HIT once.

Make sure to leave this window open as you complete the survey. When you are finished, you will return to this page to paste the code into the box.

Survey Link:

Provide the survey code here:

Appendix B

Procedural Justice Items

Source

Steiner, D. D. & Gilliland, S. W. (1996). Fairness reactions to personnel selection techniques in France and the United States. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(2), 134-141. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.134

Appendix C

Organizational Attraction Items

Source

Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). Measuring attraction to organizations.

Educational & Psychological Measurement, 63(6), 986-1001. doi:

10.1177/0013164403258403

Appendix D

LinkedIn Recruitment Vignettes

LinkedIn Absent

Assume you are seeking a new job and are searching for available positions online. You are using online job boards such as Monster.com, Indeed.com, ZipRecruiter.com, and Google. Once you find a position that catches your eye, you click on it to read the job description. You have never heard of the company before, but most of the responsibilities listed align with your interests; however, you are unsure about a few. Additionally, you match perfectly with the educational requirements but do not have the experience they require. The job description also notes that the company offers a full benefits package, comprehensive training program, and advancement opportunities. Next, you look at the application materials and see that they are requesting a cover letter, résumé, and three professional references.

LinkedIn Passive

Assume you are seeking a new job and are searching for available positions online. You are using online job boards such as Monster.com, Indeed.com, ZipRecruiter.com, and Google. Once you find a position that catches your eye, you click on it to read the job description. You have never heard of the company before, but most of the responsibilities listed align with your interests; however, you are unsure about a few. Additionally, you match perfectly with the educational requirements but do not have the experience they require. The job description also notes that the company offers a full benefits package, comprehensive training program, and advancement opportunities. Next, you look at the application materials and see that they are requesting a cover letter, résumé, and three professional references. At the very bottom of the page you see “Please Connect with Us on LinkedIn!!!” in large bold-faced letters followed by the LinkedIn logo.

LinkedIn Active

Assume you are seeking a new job and are searching for available positions online. You have just begun your search using online job boards such as Monster.com, Indeed.com, ZipRecruiter.com, and Google when you see that you have a new message on LinkedIn. Curious, you open the message to read:

Hi (*Participant's Pseudonym*),

I hope your day is going well! I had the chance to review your profile today and wanted to contact you about a career opportunity with my company, Peak Global. Your education, previous work experience, skills, and your involvement in the community is exactly the type of experience I am looking for to fill our (*participant's next employment opportunity*) position. We offer entry-level candidates a full benefits package, comprehensive training program, and advancement opportunities.

I would be happy to arrange a phone interview with you. Please let me know when you could set aside 10-15 minutes to speak today and the best phone number for me to call. In

the meantime, you can visit our profile for more information and view the job description by clicking [here](#).

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response!

Best Regards,

Sofia Byers
Peak Global | Corporate Recruiter

After following the link to the job description, you find that most of the responsibilities listed align with your interests, but you are unsure about a few of them. Additionally, you match perfectly with the educational requirements but do not have the experience they require. Next, you look at the application materials and see that they are requesting a cover letter, résumé, and three professional references.

Appendix E

Reaction and Attraction Items

Overall, based on the scenario described above, how favorable or unfavorable would your reaction be toward that organization?

5-point response scale ranging from 1 (*Highly unfavorable*) to 5 (*Highly favorable*)

Based on the scenario described above, how would you rate the company's attractiveness?

5-point response scale ranging from 1 (*Very unattractive*) to 5 (*Very attractive*)

Appendix F

Demographic Items

What is your age?

Write-in response

What is your gender?

Male; Female; Non-binary; Prefer not to respond

What is your race?

African American; American Indian/Alaskan Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian/Other

Pacific Islander; White/Caucasian; Prefer not to respond

What is your ethnicity?

Hispanic or Latino; Not Hispanic or Latino; Prefer not to respond

What is your current employment status?

Employed Full-time; Employed Part-time; Not Employed

Appendix G

IRB Approval Letter

March 3, 2020

Joseph Ostrowski

Re: Protocol #19-095, *Applicant Reactions to the Use of LinkedIn in Recruitment and Selection*

Dear Mr. Ostrowski:

The IRB has reviewed the materials regarding your study, referenced above, and has determined that it meets the criteria for the Exempt from Review category under Federal Regulation 45CFR46. Your protocol is approved as exempt research, and therefore requires no further oversight by the IRB. We appreciate your thorough treatment of the issues raised and your timely response.

If you wish to modify your study, including the addition of data collection sites, it will be necessary to obtain IRB approval prior to implementing the modification. If any adverse events occur, please notify the IRB immediately.

Please contact our office if you have any questions. We wish you success with your project!

Sincerely,

Morrie Mullins, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board
Xavier University

MEM/sb

Appendix H

Informed Consent

Study Overview

My name is Joseph Ostrowski and you are being given the opportunity to volunteer to participate in a project conducted through Xavier University. The purpose of this study is to investigate applicant reactions to various methods used in the recruitment and selection process. Participants in this study will be asked to complete a short survey containing about 60 items. These items will ask you to rate your agreement with several statements and three scenarios. The study should take 15 minutes for you to complete. There are no risks related to participation in this study, and there are no direct non-compensation benefits to you. After completing the study survey, you will be provided with a completion code to confirm your completion on the Mechanical Turk (MTurk) website and request compensation. There are no risks related to participation in this study, and you will receive \$1.50 upon the researcher's approval of your HIT.

Nature and Purpose of the Project

This study investigates applicant perceptions and reactions to various recruitment and selection sources. Of focal interest is how applicants react to modern procedures in a recruitment and selection context. Additionally, this study is investigating the impact modern procedures in recruitment and selection have on an organization's attractiveness.

Why You Were Invited to Take Part

You have been invited to take part in this study because you are an MTurk worker in the United States with a history of high-quality work. All information from this study will be reported in aggregate form only, and your participation (or nonparticipation) will have no effect on your relationship with the Xavier University or MTurk.

Study Requirements

To participate in this study, you must be an MTurk worker in the United States, completed a minimum of 50 HITs, and have a minimum 95% HIT acceptance rate.

Benefits

There are no direct non-compensation benefits to you. Indirect benefits may include a better understanding of how different recruitment and selection resources are used by employers and perceived by applicants during recruitment and selection, as well as what these perceptions mean for organizations.

Anonymity

Your participation will remain anonymous so long as you do not choose to provide your real name in the survey and do not contact the researcher through MTurk. Your MTurk Worker ID will be recorded for compensation purposes, but will not be linked to survey responses, nor will it be shared with anyone not directly involved in this research study. No personally identifying information that may be available on your Amazon public profile will be accessed. Any personal identifiers will be removed, and the deidentified information may be used for future research without seeking additional informed consent. The only way I will be able to identify you is if you contact me with a question through MTurk.

Compensation

You will be compensated with \$1.50 for the completion of this survey if you answer all the questions and pass all the quality checks. To receive compensation, you must enter the completion code on the MTurk website. Participation is voluntary, and you are free to withdraw at any point. However, you will not receive the completion code to receive compensation until you finish the survey. As such, if you withdraw before that point, you will not receive compensation.

Please note that there are several attention checks items in this survey. Your HIT will be rejected, and you will not be compensated if you fail one or more attention checks.

Refusal to participate in this study will have NO EFFECT ON ANY FUTURE SERVICES you may be entitled to from the University or MTurk. You are FREE TO WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY AT ANY TIME WITHOUT PENALTY.

If you have any questions at any time (during or after the study), you may contact the principal investigator, Joseph Ostrowski, at ostrowskij1@xavier.edu or the research supervisor, Mark Nagy, at nagyms@xavier.edu. Questions about your rights as a research participant should be directed to Xavier University's Institutional Review Board at (513) 745-2870, or irb@xavier.edu.

You may print a copy of this consent document for your records or contact Joseph Ostrowski at the email address listed above to request a copy.

By clicking the button to continue, you affirm the following: I have been given information about this research study, its risks and benefits, have had the opportunity to contact the researcher with any questions, and to have those questions answered to my satisfaction. By completing the elements of the study as previously described to me, I understand that I am giving my informed consent to participate in this research study.

Appendix I

Participant Write-in Items

A pseudonym for yourself

*Note: **DO NOT** provide your full name or last name*

Name of the next employment opportunity you are hoping to obtain